



**214 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-56542-2024

Date of decision : 31.01.2025

Jagjeet Singh

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Surinder Garg, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. J.S. Arora, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Nirmaljeet Singh Sidhu, Advocate
for the complainant.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in the present petition is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.112 dated 24.08.2024, under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 of IPC (Sections 467, 468, 471 of IPC added later on), registered at Police Station Sadar Bathinda, District Bathinda.

2. As per the facts of the case, the FIR in the present case was lodged on the statement of Lovedeep Singh. It has been alleged that Jagjeet Singh in conspiracy with Gurjeet Singh, Tej Singh and Amarjit Singh have prepared a fake and forged agreement to sell dated 13.05.2023 with his fake signatures. It was further alleged that on the basis of this forged agreement to sell they were harassing Lovedeep Singh in order to grab his land. Request was made to take legal action against the culprits. On registration of the FIR, investigation commenced. Petitioner was arrested in this case on 12.09.2024. Petitioner approached the Court of learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Bathinda praying for grant of bail however, after hearing both the sides, learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Bathinda,



declined the same vide his order dated 03.10.2024. Thereafter, petitioner filed an application for bail before the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Bathinda and the same was declined vide order dated 28.10.2024. Hence, petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the present petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. He submits that petitioner has been alleged to be the attesting witness to the forged agreement to sell. It is submitted that complainant has already challenged this agreement to sell before the learned Civil Court and the case is pending adjudication. Co-accused Amarjit Singh has already been granted anticipatory bail by this Court. He further submits that investigation is complete and challan is also presented. He thus, submits that the dispute is of civil nature and petitioner has no criminal antecedents. He thus, submits that in the facts and circumstances of the case, petitioner deserves to be granted regular bail.

4. Learned counsel for the complainant has opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that petitioner has actively participated in the offence committed wherein forged agreement to sell has been made by the petitioner in conspiracy with the co-accused. It is submitted that no ground is made out for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

5. Learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted the petitioner has played an active role in forging the agreement to sell. However, he affirms that co-accused Amarjit Singh has been granted anticipatory bail by this Court. He has submitted that investigation is complete and challan has already been filed. He has placed on record custody certificate of the petitioner.

6. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that on registration of the FIR, investigation commenced and petitioner was arrested on 12.09.2024. As submitted investigation is already complete. Two of the co-accused are already on anticipatory bail. Custody certificate filed by the State shows that petitioner has no criminal antecedents.

7. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. The trial of the case will take sufficiently long time. Thus, keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

31.01.2025
m.sharma

(**RAJESH BHARDWAJ**)
JUDGE

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