



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH
208

CRM-M-56901-2024 (O&M)
Date of decision: 20.03.2025

Anshu Grover
.....Petitioner
Versus
State of Punjab and another
.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Sangram S. Saron, Advocate
for the petitioner.
Mr. Sandeep Kumar, DAG, Punjab.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR J. (Oral)

1. This petition has been filed under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023, seeking anticipatory bail in case FIR No.155 dated 23.12.2023, registered under Sections 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 447, 511 & 120-B IPC, at Police Station Sarabha Nagar, Ludhiana, District Ludhiana.

2. On 14.11.2024, the following order was passed:-

“XX XX XX XX
The FIR in question was lodged by Dharamjit Singh, wherein he stated that he had purchased plot No.122, Sunil Park, Village Barewal Awana, Tehsil Ludhiana (West) on 27.02.2010 and the sale deed was registered on 03.03.2010 vide Wasika No.11515 and that the mutation was thereafter also sanctioned in his favour on the basis of said sale deed. The complainant alleged that subsequently he came to know that some persons were raising construction on his property and when he made enquires, he got to know that the persons, who had taken illegal possession of his



property and were raising construction, are Sanjay Miglani and his son Nitish Miglani.

It is further the case of prosecution that upon enquiries, it transpired that another sale deed dated 23.01.2023 in respect of the same property had been executed in favour of Sanjay Miglani and his wife Taruna by one Lakhwinder Singh, who claimed himself to be owner of the said property on the strength of sale deed stated to be executed in his favour on 11.11.1994 bearing Wasika No.25998.

It is further the case of prosecution that as a matter of fact the sale deed dated 11.11.1994 was a bogus document and that Lakhwinder Singh had sold the property further to Sanjay Miglani and Taruna on the basis of said bogus document, which somehow also found its way in the revenue record with the help of some revenue officials.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he has falsely been implicated in the present case on the premises that he was posted as Record Keeper in the office of the Sub Registrar, Ludhiana (West) where the alleged tampering had taken place, whereas the petitioner had joined as Record Keeper in the said office only on 14.07.2022 and the alleged tampering with the record i.e. insertion of sale deed dated 11.11.1994 in the computerized data was done much earlier i.e. on 23.02.2022, as has been found upon a detailed enquiry conducted by the Tehsildar, Jagraon, which has been endorsed by the Deputy Commissioner as well.

Learned counsel in this regard has drawn the attention of this Court to the enquiry report dated 25.01.2024 (Annexure P-2), which is a detailed enquiry conducted by the Tehsildar, Jagraon wherein all the



technical issues as regards uploading/insertion of various documents in encrypted PDF form in the revenue record have been noticed with the help of Sale Deed/Wasika Retrieval System. The relevant portion of the said enquiry is reproduced hereinafter:

“According to the report of District System Manager, Ludhiana, the date of Encrypted PDF of this Sale Deed/Wasika is shown as 02.02.2017 and its copy has been issued by the Record Room on 23.02.2022. On the basis of which, said mutation has been entered. In this way, fake Sale Deed/Wasika No.25998 dated 11.11.1994 has been planted/affixed in Bahi prior to 23.02.2022.

xx

xx

xx

From my inquiry, it is clearly revealed that Sale Deed/Wasika No.25998 dated 11.11.1994 is fake and it has been deliberately planted by tampering with manual and computer records of record room.”

Learned counsel for the petitioner, thus, submitted that having regard to the aforesaid detailed enquiry report, the tampering with the record, particularly the insertion of forged sale deed has been made prior to 14.07.2022, when the petitioner had joined the office of the Sub Registrar, Ludhiana (West). Learned counsel submitted that as a matter of fact the Deputy Commissioner after examining the said detailed report had himself furnished the names following three erring officials, who were posted there at the relevant period:

“1. Sh. Gagandeep Singh, ASM (overall Incharge of Scanning Project) from the year 2015 till now.

2. Sh. Kuldeep Singh, Record Keeper (East) from 02.05.2017 to 03.09.2021.



3. *Sh. Jang Singh, Record Keeper (East) from 20.09.2021 to 14.07.2022.”*

Notice of motion for 20.03.2025.

Meanwhile, in the event of arrest, the petitioner be released on interim bail subject to his furnishing personal bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting/Investigating Officer. However, the petitioner shall join the investigation as and when called upon to do so and cooperate with the Investigating Officer and shall also abide by the conditions as provided under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.”

3. Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Rajpal Singh, at the very outset, informs the Court that the petitioner has joined the investigation and his custodial interrogation is not required.

4. In view of the statement of learned State counsel, order dated 14.11.2024 is hereby made absolute. The petitioner shall abide by the terms and conditions envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS (*erstwhile Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973*).

5. The petition stands disposed of.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

20.03.2025
yakub

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No