

2025:PHHC:147787



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.44939 of 2023
Date of Decision: 29.10.2025
Reserved on: 14.10.2025

Jasbir Singh Wadaich ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Ankit Bishnoi, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Ramta Chowdhary, DAG, Punjab,
for the respondent-State.

Ms. Puja Chopra, Advocate,
for the complainant.

MANISHA BATRA, J.

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking anticipatory bail in the FIR mentioned below:-

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
91	25.08.2023	Mallanwala, District Ferozepur	199, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of IPC

2. Brief facts relevant for the purpose of disposal of this petition are that the aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of a complaint filed by complainant Manpreet Kaur alleging that her husband Daljit Singh had died on 02.12.2021 in a road side accident. After the

2025:PHHC:147787



death of her husband, the behaviour of members of her in-laws family had worsened towards her and they started harassing her. They threw her out of her matrimonial house in March 2022 and proclaimed that she would not be getting any share in the property left by her husband. In connivance with each other and in order to deprive the complainant and her minor daughter of their rights from the property of her husband, they sold the Fortuner car bearing registration No.PB-05-AJ0023 owned by her husband, after about six months of his death by forging the signatures of her husband and by showing him to be alive. They also prepared false and fabricated sale letter and affidavit. The present petitioner attested those documents as a witness while fully knowing that Daljit Singh had already died. She alleged that the Fortuner car was sold for a sum of Rs.40 lakhs and the entire money was usurped by the petitioner and the co-accused and thereby they had cheated her and committed fraud with her and deprived her of her rights in the car in question. As such, she prayed for taking action in the matter.

3. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings have been initiated and are underway. Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner who is brother-in-law of the complainant, had filed an application for grant of anticipatory bail which had been dismissed by the Court of learned Sessions Judge, Ferozepur vide order dated 01.09.2023.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case and is a victim of controversy that has

arisen between the complainant and members of her in-laws family. The

2025:PHHC:147787



complainant is widow of his brother-in-law after whose death she has been claiming major share in the land belonging to her in-laws family. It was on account of dispute with them that she has implicated the petitioner due to his being elder brother-in-law in the family. The petitioner is not beneficiary of transaction of sale of the car. Some documents had been got signed from him from a car dealer/broker to whom the Fortuner car in the name of Daljit Singh had been sold. He did not forge signatures of deceased Daljit Singh on such documents and had simply signed some papers. The entire case is based on documentary evidence. His custodial interrogation is not required. No recovery is to be effected from him. He has already joined investigation in pursuance of order dated 11.09.2023. It is, therefore, argued that he deserves to be extended benefit of pre arrest bail.

5. Learned Deputy Advocate General, Punjab has submitted that the petitioner has joined investigation and his custodial interrogation is not required. Learned counsel for the complainant, on the other hand, has vehemently argued that there are serious allegations against the petitioner who is brother-in-law of the complainant. After the death of her husband, he connived with the co-accused and got procured her signatures on an affidavit which was converted into a document giving her consent for transfer of the Fortuner car belonging to her husband in the name of her father-in-law and she has never intended to sign any such affidavit. The petitioner and the co-accused had sold the said vehicle after forging the signatures of her husband

2025:PHHC:147787



and showing him to be alive with intent to usurp the sale proceeds to themselves and thereby they committed offences of forgery and cheating. No extraordinary circumstance for grant of bail is made out in his favour. His custodial interrogation is must. Therefore, it is urged that the petitioner does not deserve to be extended benefit of anticipatory bail.

6. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

7. The petitioner in connivance with the co-accused is alleged to have signed as a witness one affidavit and some other documents on the basis of which Fortuner car in the name of husband of the complainant was sold. Annexure R-5 is copy of the said affidavit where signatures of Daljit Singh are shown to be appended on 06.06.2022 whereas infact he died on 02.12.2021. The petitioner was witness to the said affidavit. The case is, however, based on documentary evidence. The petitioner has already joined investigation. Given the nature of the allegations, this Court is of the considered opinion that pre trial incarceration of the petitioner would not serve any fruitful purpose. As such, a case is made out for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the order dated 11.09.2023, granting interim bail to the petitioner is made absolute and subject to furnishing of personal as well as surety bonds to the satisfaction of Investigating Officer/Arresting Officer, if the same have not been furnished so far and further subject to the following conditions:-

(i) the petitioner shall cooperate with the investigation and shall appear before the Investigating officer/Arresting officer as and

2025:PHHC:147787



when required.

(ii) He shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him/her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any Police Officer.

(iii) He shall not commit any similar offence while on bail.

(iv) He shall not leave the country without prior permission of the Court.

8. In case of violation of any of the above conditions, the jurisdictional Court shall be empowered to consider the application for cancellation, if any, and pass appropriate orders in accordance with law.

9. It is clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

29.10.2025
manju

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No