



In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana, at Chandigarh

Criminal Misc. No. M-43937 of 2025

Reserved On: 03.11.2025

Pronounced On: 06.11.2025

Gurpreet Singh alias Johnu

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Surya Partap Singh.

Present: Mr. Ketan Chopra, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. I.P.Sabharwal, Deputy Advocate General,
Punjab, for the respondent.

Surya Partap Singh, J.

1. For the commission of offence punishable under Sections 318(4), 319(2), 336(2), 338, 340(2) and 61(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, hereinafter being referred as “BNS” only, and Section 82 of the Registration Act, 1908, the FIR No. 04 dated 27.02.2025 has been lodged in Police Station Economic Offences Wing, Vigilance Bureau, District Ludhiana, Punjab. This is first petition for bail, filed by the petitioner, under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, hereinafter being referred to as “BNSS” only.

2. Briefly stating the facts emerging from record are that the above mentioned FIR came into being in response to a communication by the Chief Director, Vigilance Bureau, Punjab to the Senior Superintendent of Police, Vigilance Bureau, Economic Offence Wing, Ludhiana. As per

prosecution while acting upon the above mentioned letter, when enquiries were made from Sub Registrar-Jagsir Singh Sran and Registration Clerk-Krishan Gopal, in the office of Sub Registrar Ludhiana (West), it was revealed that the sale deed No. 2024-25/101/1/20859 dated 11.02.2025 was executed with regard to a plot admesasuring 14 kanals, and that the above mentioned sale deed was executed by somebody by impersonating himself as 'Deep Singh', the owner of the above mentioned plot. It is the case of prosecution that in view of above mentioned information, the formal FIR was lodged and investigation taken up. As per prosecution, during the course of investigation, it was found that the petitioner was the person who had impersonated himself as Deep Singh, owner of the plot and signed the sale deed as such.

4. Heard.

5. It has been argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is innocent having no nexus, whatsoever, with the commission of crime. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner is illiterate who was working with a property dealer, and that his employer was instrumental in getting the sale deed executed. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, on the instructions of his employer, the petitioner had signed the sale deed without knowing the contents thereof. The learned counsel for the petitioner has further contended that, in fact, the Investigating Agency is hand in glove with the employer of the petitioner, who has been let-off in the present case, despite fact that he is the main culprit. The learned counsel for the petitioner has also argued that otherwise also, the offence is triable by the Court of Judicial Magistrate and nothing is

left to be recovered from the possession of petitioner, and that the trial is not likely to be concluded in the near future.

6. In addition to above, it has also been argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that the identifier, namely Baghel Singh has already been accorded the benefit of anticipatory bail in this case.

7. While controverting the above mentioned arguments, the learned State counsel has argued that the petitioner is the main accused in the present case, as he had impersonated himself as Deep Singh, the owner of the property, and signed the sale deed by projecting himself as owner of the plot. It has also been argued by learned State counsel that otherwise also, there is no delay in the trial of the present case and the custody of the petitioner in this case is barely little more than seven months. According to learned State counsel, in the present case, in view of gravity of offence, the petitioner is not entitled for benefit of bail.

8. The record has been perused carefully.

9. In the present case, at the threshold itself, it is pertinent to mention that the allegations against the petitioner are with regard to execution of the sale deed of the property of somebody else, by impersonating himself as the owner of that property. By executing the above mentioned sale deed, not only the cloud with regard to title of actual owner, over his property, has been created, but also the purchaser who got the sale deed executed has been duped.

10. A perusal of the record of this case shows that in the present case there are very specif and categoric allegations against the petitioner that he had signed the sale deed by impersonating himself as owner of the

property and even he appeared before the Registrar as such and got the sale deed registered. The above mentioned action on the part of petitioner speaks in volume about the criminal intent behind the above mentioned action of the petitioner. It is also relevant to mention here that the petitioner is in custody for a period of seven months only, and it cannot be said that he is facing undue long incarceration due to delay in trial.

11. As far as the plea with regard to benefit of anticipatory bail to the co-accused is concerned, in view of the fact that the co-accused was not the person who had impersonated himself as owner of the property, or signed the document in any capacity, it is hereby held that the role being different, the petitioner cannot claim parity with his above said co-accused.

12. Taking into consideration the cumulative effect of all the aforesaid factors, the role of petitioner and the gravity of offence, it is hereby held that the petitioner is not entitled for the benefit of bail and the present petition is devoid of merits. Hence, the present petition is hereby dismissed, accordingly.

(Surya Partap Singh)
Judge

November 06, 2025
“DK”

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No