



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

118+213

CRM-M-54771-2025 (O&M)

RANJIT SINGH

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

CRM-M-65593-2025

AMARJIT KAUR

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

Decided on : 22.12.2025

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Ms. Gursharan K. Mann, Senior Advocate, with
Mr. Sanjeev Sharma, Advocate,
for the petitioner (in CRM-M-54771-2025).

Mr. Gurmeet Singh, Advocate, and
Mr. S.K. Kanojia, Advocate,
for the petitioner (in CRM-M-65593-2025).

Mr. Jasdeep Singh, Addl. AG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

CRM-52415-2025 in CRM-M-54771-2025

1. Present application has been moved by the
applicant/petitioner for placing on record the relevant documents i.e. true
translated copy of sale deed, bank statements and a CD, as Annexures P-2
to P-4, respectively.



2. Considering the averments mentioned in the application, prayer made in the application is allowed and documents i.e. true translated copy of sale deed, bank statements and a CD, are ordered to be taken on record as Annexures P-2 to P-4. Registry is directed to tag the same at the appropriate place on the file.

3. CM stands disposed of.

CRM-47644-2025 in CRM-M-54771-2025

1. Present application has been moved by the applicant/petitioner for placing on record copy of medical records of the petitioner, as Annexure P-2.

2. Considering the averments mentioned in the application, prayer made in the application is allowed and copy of medical records of the petitioner, is ordered to be taken on record as Annexure P-2. Registry is directed to tag the same at the appropriate place on the file.

3. CM stands disposed of.

Main Cases, i.e. CRM-M-54771-2025 and CRM-M-65593-2025

1. By this common order, both the aforementioned petitions, i.e. CRM-M-54771-2025 and CRM-M-65593-2025 shall stand disposed of.

2. Petitioner, namely Ranjit Singh, has filed petition CRM-M-54771-2025, seeking grant of regular bail, in case, FIR No.0070, dated 26.08.2024, under Sections 177, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 and 34 of IPC, 1860, registered at Police Station Garhdiwala, District Hoshiarpur.

3. Petitioner, namely Amarjit Kaur, has filed petition CRM-M-65593-2025, seeking grant of regular bail, in case, FIR No.0070, dated



26.08.2024, under Sections 177, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 of IPC, 1860, (Section 120-B of IPC added later on), registered at Police Station Garhdiwala, District Hoshiarpur.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) contends that, as per the case of prosecution concerning the disputed property, there existed an agreement to sell. When the sale deed was about to mature, Civil Suit No.231 of 2019, titled “Vinay Sharma vs. Amarjit Kaur and others”, was filed on the basis of an agreement to sell dated 30.04.2016. In the said suit, plaintiff pleaded that the total sale consideration for execution of the sale deed was fixed at Rs.10 lakhs, out of which an amount of Rs.8 lakhs had already been paid to the defendants.

Along with the civil suit, an application under Order XXXIX Rules 1 and 2 CPC read with Section 151 CPC was filed, which was dismissed by learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Dasuya, vide order dated 27.09.2019. Aggrieved thereof, Civil Miscellaneous Appeal No.152 of 2019 was preferred, which was allowed, vide order dated 06.03.2023, directing both the parties to maintain status quo with regard to the alienation of the suit property. The said order was duly entered in the revenue records, vide rapat No.273 dated 05.05.2023.

It is further alleged that during the pendency of the proceedings before the appellate court, defendants prepared a forged order showing that an order of status quo had already been passed by the appellate court in the miscellaneous appeal. By taking advantage of the forged order, defendants allegedly got the mutation entry changed and



thereafter, sold the same disputed property to one Nirmal Kaur, who is wife of petitioner Ranjit Singh.

The allegation of preparing the forged order using a fake seal of the court is primarily against petitioner Amarjit Kaur.

5. Learned counsel for both the petitioners jointly argue that all the allegations are triable by the Court of learned Magistrate and most of the evidence is documentary in nature.

6. It is submitted that petitioner Ranjit Singh has been in judicial custody since 21.07.2025, i.e. for a period of about 05 months, and petitioner Amarjit Kaur has been in judicial custody since 21.06.2025, i.e. for a period of about 06 months. *Challan* has already been presented before the competent court. No recovery is to be effected from either of the petitioners, and no useful purpose would be served by keeping them in further incarceration.

Investigation qua both the petitioners stands completed and *challan* has been filed; however, the process of recording of the statements of the prosecution witnesses is yet to commence. Consequently, conclusion of the trial is likely to take a considerable time.

7. It is further submitted that neither of the petitioners has any criminal antecedents; and charges are yet to be framed. In view of the aforesaid circumstances, learned counsel jointly pray for grant of the concession of regular bail to both the petitioners in the present case.

8. In response to the arguments addressed by learned counsel for the petitioners, learned State counsel, produces the custody certificate dated 19.12.2025 of petitioner – Amarjit Kaur, in Court today, which is



taken on record. Office to tag the same at appropriate place. A copy thereof has been handed over to the counsel for the petitioner.

9. Learned State counsel is unable to dispute any of the factual assertions made by learned counsel for the petitioners before this Court today, including the total period of incarceration already undergone by them, the fact that process of recording the statements of the prosecution witnesses is yet to commence, and no other criminal case has been registered against either of the petitioners. However, he nevertheless prays for dismissal of both the present petitions.

10. This Court has heard the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties and has also perused the record available before it.

11. It is noticed that petitioner Ranjit Singh has been in judicial custody since 21.07.2025, i.e. for a period of about 05 months and petitioner Amarjit Kaur since 21.06.2025, i.e. for a period of about 06 months. *Challan* in the present case has already been presented before the competent Court. No recovery is required to be effected from either of the petitioners and no useful purpose would be served by keeping them in further incarceration.

Investigation qua both the petitioners stands completed and the challan has been submitted; however, process of recording the statements of the prosecution witnesses has yet to commence. Consequently, the conclusion of the trial is likely to take a considerable time.

Admittedly, no other criminal case has been registered against either of the petitioners and charges are yet to be framed.



12. Therefore, in view of the totality of the circumstances, nature of the allegations levelled against the petitioners, and the factors noticed here above, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of regular bail to both the petitioners.

13. Consequently, prayer made in both the present petitions is **allowed**. Petitioners, namely Ranjit Singh (in CRM-M-54771-2025) and Amarjit Kaur (in CRM-M-65593-2025), are ordered to be released on bail, subject to their 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.

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

15. 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.

16. Both the petitions stand disposed of.

17. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of other connected case.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

22.12.2025
Lavisha

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO
Whether Reportable: YES/NO