



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

222

CRM-M-52959-2024

Date of decision: July 9th, 2025

Navdeep Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Ms. Rajwant Kaur and Mr. Saurav Sharma, Advocates
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Rana, Senior Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.

Petitioner is seeking the concession of regular bail in FIR No.101 dated 16.06.2024 under Sections 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 120-B of the IPC and Sections 13(2) and 88 of The Prevention of Corruption Act, registered at Police Station Dharamkot, District Moga.

2. Learner counsel appearing for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case. It is further submitted that the allegations pertaining to the preparation of the assessment and manipulation of revenue entries do not directly involve the petitioner, as the assessment in question was purportedly made by one Assistant Gagandeep Singh. While drawing the attention of this Court to Annexure P5, it has been argued that the assessment and the accompanying muster roll had been duly verified by higher officials i.e. the Kanungo and the Tehsildar, and that the petitioner is being used as a scapegoat to shield the culpability of senior officials. It has been further argued that the assessment was attested by the Lambardar at the office

of the District Revenue Officer, which as per the learner counsel, negates any inference of manipulation or *mala fide* on part of the petitioner.

3. It has lastly been submitted that the petitioner has been in custody since 18.06.2024 and that the investigation is complete, with the challan having been presented on 07.11.2024. Charges have been framed, and the trial is at a nascent stage as none of the 19 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far. A prayer has, therefore, been made for accepting the prayer of the petitioner and enlarging him on bail since there is no possibility of the trial concluding in the near future.

4. *Per contra*, learned State has opposed the prayer and submissions made by the counsel opposite by highlighting the gravity of the allegations. It has been submitted, on instructions, that the petitioner, in his capacity as a Patwari, not only abused his official position, but actively participated in a premeditated conspiracy to forge and fabricate revenue documents and manipulated mutation entries, thereby securing undue and fraudulent compensation for the beneficiary, Dilkush Kumari, amounting to approximately ₹1,00,65,724/-.

5. It has still further been asserted by the learner State counsel that the petitioner was entrusted with the responsibility of entering and verifying revenue records and overseeing disbursal of compensation. Instead, he deliberately recorded an incorrect mutation of land measuring 6 *kanals* and 18 *marlas*, with the ulterior motive of facilitating wrongful gain.

6. It has also been informed by the learned State counsel, on instructions, that the petitioner is involved in another criminal case of

a similar nature, which raises a serious apprehension about the propensity of the petitioner to indulge in acts of corruption and misuse of official position.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material on record.

8. The allegations against the petitioner are not only specific, but are also supported by official documents indicating manipulation of revenue records, which were under the custody and control of the petitioner in his official capacity.

9. The petitioner, as a Patwari, was vested with a fiduciary duty to uphold the integrity of the Revenue Department. The alleged conduct, manipulating land records, entering wrong mutations and enabling wrongful disbursement of compensation, betrays that public trust. Such acts, if proven, strike at the root of transparency in governance and erode the credibility of public institutions.

10. The quantum of loss caused to the State exceeding ₹1 crore and the active role attributed to the petitioner in the conspiracy do not entitle him to the concession of bail at this nascent stage.

11. The fact that the petitioner is facing prosecution in another criminal case, involving similar allegations of corruption, further compounds the seriousness of the matter and strengthens the apprehension of continued misuse of liberty if released on bail.

12. Though the investigation is stated to be complete and trial has commenced, it needs to be emphasised that this itself cannot be a ground to enlarge a public servant on bail when credible material points towards his *prima facie* involvement in a deliberate and fraudulent conspiracy, resulting in huge losses to the State Exchequer.

13. In view of the above, considering the gravity and the magnitude of financial loss to the State Exchequer, this Court does not deem it fit to extend the concession of bail to the petitioner.

14. Accordingly, the instant petition stands dismissed.

15. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

July 9th, 2025
Puneet

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes
Whether reportable	:	Yes