



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

217

CRM-M-46867-2025
Decided on : 29.08.2025

Parampal Singh . . . Petitioner(s)
Versus
State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Gurinder Singh Hayer, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Jasdeep Singh, Addl. AG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed here-under:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Parampal Singh	35	24.10.2024	419, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of IPC, 1860	Punjab State Crime Phase 4	SAS Nagar (Mohali)

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that all the offences alleged are triable by the Court of learned Magistrate. The FIR was registered on the complaint of Bhola Singh and Amrik Singh, both sons of Sukhdev Singh, who had expired on 24.01.2012. It is alleged that one Devinder Singh, impersonating Sukhdev Singh, executed a fake General Power of Attorney (GPA) in favour of the petitioner – Parampal Singh, pertaining to land measuring more than 12 acres, which originally belonged to the deceased Sukhdev Singh. On the basis of this alleged impersonation,



ownership of the land was sought to be transferred in favour of the petitioner by way of GPA dated 19.02.2023. Said GPA, however, was not executed by the real Sukhdev Singh (who was already deceased), but by another person with the same name, who was not the true owner of the property.

2. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner is an illiterate person, who merely worked under the instructions of the actual beneficiary, namely, co-accused Khushwant Pal Singh Brar. Acting under his influence and allurements, the petitioner executed a sale deed dated 17.03.2023 in favour of the said co-accused, and to show payment of consideration, an amount of Rs.89,90,000/- was reflected as paid to the petitioner. Petitioner, however, acted under a *bona fide* belief and fell prey to the inducement of the co-accused – Khushwant Pal Singh Brar.

3. It is further argued that investigation in the matter already stands concluded and the petitioner has been in custody since 24.12.2024. As the case of the prosecution primarily rests on documentary evidence, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in further custody. Moreover, co-accused Khushwant Pal Singh Brar, the principal beneficiary of the transaction, has already been granted regular bail by this Court vide order dated 28.07.2025, passed in CRM-M-18748-2025(O&M), titled as “Khushwant Pal Singh Brar v. State of Punjab” (Annexure P-4). Thus, while claiming parity with the co-accused, learned counsel prays for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in the present case.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel, oppose the plea of bail to the petitioner by arguing that present case involves a serious fraud committed against the actual owner of the land. It is contended that all the accused persons acted in connivance with each other in order to usurp a



substantial piece of land measuring over 12 acres. The act, as per the prosecution, is not an isolated incident but part of a larger conspiracy to grab valuable land through impersonation and forged documents.

Further argues that though the co-accused has been granted bail by this Court, the role attributed to the present petitioner is distinct, as he is the one in whose favour the alleged forged GPA was executed, and who thereafter executed the sale deed. Thus, he prays for dismissal of present petition.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and on perusal of the record, this Court finds that the case of the prosecution is primarily based on documentary evidence. The petitioner has remained in custody since 24.12.2024 and investigation already stands concluded. Further trial is likely to take considerable time for its conclusion. It is also not disputed that all the offences alleged are triable by the Court of learned Magistrate. Besides, co-accused, namely, Khushwant Pal Singh Brar, has already been granted concession of regular bail by this Court. Keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this Court is of the view that the petitioner deserves the concession of regular bail.

6. At this stage, reliance has been placed by counsel for the petitioner on the judgment passed by Hon'ble the Supreme Court in the case of Sanjay Chandra v. CBI, AIR 2012 SC 830, wherein it was held that under-trial prisoners cannot be detained for an indefinite period, especially in cases where trial is likely to take a long time and the offences are not punishable with death or life imprisonment.

7. Accordingly, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the



concession of regular bail to the petitioner in the present case.

8. Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**.
Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

9. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

10. Any of the discussion done and recorded here above, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible, in accordance with law.

11. Petition stands **disposed of**.

Misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

August 29, 2025

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*
Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*