



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-64813-2024

Reeta Rani

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Petitioner

.....Respondents

CRM-M-64814-2024

Parwinder Singh and another

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Petitioners

.....Respondents

CRM-M-20597-2025

Kamaljit Singh

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Petitioner

.....Respondents

CRM-M-36542-2025

Jaswinder Kaur

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Petitioner

.....Respondents

CRM-M-55567-2025

Kirpal Singh @ Garpal Singh

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Petitioner

.....Respondents

1.	Date when Order was reserved	17.11.2025
2.	Pronouncement of Order	04.12.2025
3.	Date of uploading Order	04.12.2025



4.	Whether operative part or full Order is pronounced	Full
5.	Delay, if any, in pronouncing of full order, and reasons thereof	Not Applicable

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. B.S. Khehar, Advocate for the petitioner(s)
(CRM-M-64813-2024 and CRM-M-64814-2024)

Mr. T.S. Chauhan, Advocate and
Mr. Karanpreet Singh, Advocate
Mr. Som Nath, Advocate
for the petitioner(s)
(in CRM-M-20597-2025).

Mr. Sahilpreet Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Kirpal Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner(in CRM-M-55567-2025)

Ms. Simsi Dhir Malhotra, Advocate
For the petitioner (in CRM-M-36542-2025)

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Mr. M.P.S. Mann, Advocate for the complainant
(in CRM-M-64813-2024).

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. By way of this common order, all the above-mentioned petitions are being decided together as they arise out of the same FIR and common allegations.

DETAILS OF PETITIONS

Sr. No.	Petition No.	Petitioner(s)	Nature of Petition
1	CRM-M-64813-2024	Reeta Rani	Anticipatory Bail
2	CRM-M-64814-2024	Parwinder Singh & Jyoti	Anticipatory Bail (Joint)
3	CRM-M-20597-2025	Kamaljit Singh	Anticipatory Bail
4	CRM-M-36542-2025	Jaswinder Kaur	Regular Bail
5	CRM-M-55567-2025	Kirpal Singh @ Garpal Singh	Regular Bail

**CRM-M-64813-2024 and other connected cases****3**

All the aforesaid petitions arise from **FIR No. 179 dated 03.12.2024**, registered at Police Station Garhshankar, District Hoshiarpur, under Sections 419, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC (corresponding to Sections 319(2), 318(4), 336(2), 338(3), 336(3), 340(2) and 61(2) BNS).

2. FIR was registered at the instance of Chander Shekhar Mehta son of Sh. Kishan Chand Mehta, who alleged that:-

“ My Taya ji (elder uncle), father and Chacha (younger uncle) died long ago. Our ancestral land has been sold on 08.07.2024, and the mutation of which has been got registered by Jaswinder Kaur wife of Kirpal Singh son Gurmel Singh in her own name fraudulently, by creating false documents, fake Aadhaar cards and by presenting forged persons and she has also availed a loan of Rupees 12 lakh from the Punjab National Bank, Sumundra, and also by preparing the forged sale deeds of other ancestral land, the mutations have been got registered. Hence, this entire matter the subject of investigation and the details of the evidence in this regard are as follows. 1. Shri Brahm Saran Mehta is the elder brother of my father, and by preparing his fake Aadhaar card, the fake Aadhaar number 5418 0079 9993 has been used, while he died on 19.01.2006 in Delhi, who was Class one gazetted officer of the Ministry of Defence.

2. Shri Shiv Saran Mehta the elder brother of my father, after preparing his fake Aadhar card, forged Aadhar No. 5528 4631 6477 has been used, while he died in Delhi on 29.05.1996, who was Civil Surgeon doctor.

3. Shri Krishan Chand Mehta, my father, after preparing his fake Aadhar Card, the forged Adhaar No. 8429 6200 5247 has been used, he died on 13.09.2008 at Garhshankar, and he was top class Turbine mechanic.

**CRM-M-64813-2024 and other connected cases****4**

4. *Shri Parhlad Narain Mehta, the younger brother of my father, after preparing his fake Aadhar Card, the forged Adhaar No. 6502 8142 3301 has been used, whereas, he died in Delhi on 15.11.2020, who was Income Tax Officer.*

5. *Shri Satgur Nath Mehta was the son of the brother of my grandfather, after preparing his forged Aadhar Card, the fake Adhaar Card No. 6502 8142 3301 has been used, while he died at Nawanshahr on 30th March 1990. His death certificate is also available. By presenting fake persons in place of these original persons the sale deed was got prepared by taking their thumb impressions, whereas all these persons were educated persons and now they do not exist in this world. On 08.07.2024, the sale deed of 12 kanals 18 Marlas land was registered in favour of Jaswinder Kaur wife of Kirpal Singh (Mobile No. 98789-37761 Aadhar No.5430 7785 4242) resident of Chak Hajipur, Tehsil Garhshankar vide Deed No. 2024-25/166/1/821 Day Monday time 03:23:55 PM by the Tehsildar Lakhwinder Singh, Registry Clerk-Gurminder Singh, which was prepared the Deed Writer Sajan Kumar Advocate Garhshankar vide Registered No.324 on 01.07.2024 and Surjit Singh who is Numberdar of Garhshankar and by making the forged person as first witness in an illegal manner attested the same, and Kuldeep Singh son of Baljit Singh resident of village Lohta, Tehsil Balachaur (Aadhar No.6550 4470 2499), on becoming the second witness testified the same, It is requested that a lot of owners of Mehta dynasty of village PanamHadbast No.149 who have already died, but by presenting fake persons, Kirpal Singh son of Gurmail Singh, resident of village Chak Hajipur Tehsil Garhshankar has got other registries in the name of his wife of Jaswinder Kaur and one registry has been done in the name of Reeta Rani wife of Devinderpal son of Mool Raj resident of Roopnagar, which is the subject of serious investigation. Deed No.2024-25/166/1/723, Dated 27.06.24 in favour of Jaswinder Kaur wife of Kirpal Singh regarding land*



CRM-M-64813-2024 and other connected cases

5

situated in village Panam (which was got registered in the name of his wife by presenting himself as her fake General Power of Attorney), Deed No. 2024-25/166/1/733, Dated 01.07.2024 in favour of Jaswinder Kaur wife of Kirpal Singh regarding land situated in village Panam. Deed No.2024-25/166/1/856 Dated 15.07.2024 in favour of Reeta, Rani wife of Davinder Pal son of Mool Raj residents of Roopnagar. The consent regarding cultivation of our land has been given since long to our respectable Joginder Singh Kang son of Diwan Singh village Chak Hajipur, who is cultivator as shareholder in it. Hence, I request that our elders are no more in this world, had they been alive then their age would have been more than 100 years. It is not possible for them to come and execute any such kind of registries. Shri Ram Rakha son of Shri Sukhdayal fake Aadhar No.3825 1823 9498 was the brother of my grandfather Shri Tarlok Chand Mehta, who has died long ago, who was 70 years old at that time. This whole matter is subject of impartial and serious investigation. With this a big scam would be unfolded. The persons of preparing forged Aadhar cards and their supporters have already entered for tarnishing in the internal security of India. It is very important to look at this serious matter and find out the accused. You are requested to take immediate appropriate legal action against the persons involved in preparing the fake documents, using the forged documents, attesting the fake documents, writers of fake sale deeds, sellers, purchasers and persons playing fraud with the banks on the basis of forged documents, and all persons supporting them directly or directedly. Applicant, Chander Shekhar, Chander Shekhar Mehta son of Shri Kishan Chand Mehta, Deep Colony, Garhshankar Mobile No. 79868-80380 dated 13.09.2024”

3. From reading of the FIR, it transpires that elders of the complainant, namely his father, *taya* and *chacha*, had expired long ago, and the ancestral land existing in their names was fraudulently got

**CRM-M-64813-2024 and other connected cases****6**

registered and thereafter mutated in the name of Jaswinder Kaur w/o Kirpal Singh by playing fraud and creating false documents, including Aadhaar cards and other papers, by impersonating the actual owners. It is further alleged that she also succeeded in availing a loan of ₹12 lakhs from Punjab National Bank on the basis of these forged documents.

4. It is further explained that several close relatives of the complainant have passed away. Complainant's *Taya Ji*, Shri Brahm Saran Mehta, who was serving as a Gazetted Officer in the Defence Ministry, expired on 19.01.2006 in Delhi. Another *Taya*, Shri Shiv Saran Mehta, who was a Civil Surgeon, expired on 29.05.1996. Complainant's father, Shri Krishan Chand Mehta, a Turbine Mechanic, expired on 13.09.2008. Shri Parhlad Narayan Mehta, the complainant's *Chacha* and an Income Tax Officer, expired on 15.11.2020. Additionally, Shri Satgur Nath Mehta, son of the brother of the complainant's grandfather, died 30.03.1990.

5. Therefore, in the FIR it is alleged that all the disputed sale deeds dated 08.07.2024 pertaining to land measuring 12 Kanal 18 Marla in favour of accused-Jaswinder Kaur w/o Kirpal Singh were registered in connivance with other accused, namely Tehsildar Lakhwinder Singh, Registry Clerk Gurwinder Singh, Deed Writer Sajan Kumar (Advocate), and Surjit Singh Numberdar of Village Garhshankar, who all acted as if they are original holders to the posts, appeared as the first witness in the illegal sale. Similarly, accused Kuldeep Singh became the second attesting witness.

**CRM-M-64813-2024 and other connected cases****7**

6. It is further alleged that accused-Kirpal Singh got the registries executed in the name of his wife Jaswinder Kaur and in the name of accused Reeta Rani in respect of land situated in Village Panam, wherein Kirpal Singh presented himself as a fake GPA-holder for executing sale deeds dated 27.06.2024, 01.07.2024, and 15.07.2024. FIR also clarifies that other ancestors, such as Shri Ram Rakha (brother of the complainant's grandfather), had died around 70 years ago, and that, had the ancestors been alive today, they would have been more than 100 years of age. Thus, an impartial and serious investigation was requested by the complainant in the FIR.

7. In **CRM-M-64813-2024 (Reeta Rani's case)**, it was explained that the case was registered against:

(i) Kirpal Singh, (ii) Jaswinder Kaur, (iii) Reeta Rani, (iv) Surjit Singh, (v) Gurdeep Singh, (vi) Jyoti Verma, (vii) Kuldeep Singh, (viii) Parwinder, and (ix) Rajesh Kumar, Advocate.

8. In the status report dated 26.10.2025 in **CRM-M-64813-2024 (Reeta Rani's case)**, role of each accused was described as under:

i) Kirpal Singh got executed a General Power of Attorney dated 21.06.2024 in his own favour by impersonating the owners Janaki Lal, Bihari Lal and Batali Ram, sons of Prabhdyal, whereas they had already expired long ago. Kirpal Singh thereafter executed a sale deed of land measuring 7 Kanal 6 Marla in the name of his wife Jaswinder Kaur on 27.06.2024.

**CRM-M-64813-2024 and other connected cases****8**

As per the disclosure statement of accused Kirpal Singh, for the purpose of executing the forged GPA dated 21.06.2024 and the sale deed dated 27.06.2024, his co-accused Jyoti Verma, Sandeep Kumar, and one peon namely Kamaljit Singh, in the Revenue Department, prepared fabricated Aadhaar cards and arranged fake persons required for impersonation of the actual owners.

During investigation, it also transpired that accused Kirpal Singh had projected himself in the GPA dated 24.06.2024 as “Gurpal Singh” on his Aadhaar card, thereby attempting to mislead the investigating agency by using two different names (Kirpal Singh and Gurpal Singh).

ii) With respect to accused-Jaswinder Kaur, the status report states that she was arrested on 02.04.2025. She got executed a sale deed dated 01.07.2024 of land measuring 4 Kanal 2 Marla by impersonating the real owners, namely Dilbagh, Satgur Nath, and Hari Krishan, sons of Matta Dutt r/o Village Panam, who had already died.

Another sale deed dated 08.07.2024 of land measuring 12 Kanal 18 Marla was also executed by Jaswinder Kaur by impersonating the already deceased real owners, namely Ram Rakha, Ram Lal, Gurbax Rai, Beant Rai, Shiv Charan, Kishan Chand and Parhlad Narayan r/o Village Panam. Accused-Reeta Rani (mother of co-accused Jyoti Verma) also executed a sale deed dated 15.07.2024 of land measuring 11 Kanal 14 Marla by impersonating the real owners who had already died, namely Malavi Devi, Devki Rani, Davinder Pal, Mohan Kumari, Sudharshan Kumari,

**CRM-M-64813-2024 and other connected cases****9**

Bihari Lal, Batli Ram, Janaki Lal, Dina Nath, Vidyasagar, and Satgur Nath r/o Village Panam.

iii) During investigation, co-accused Surjit Singh (Lambardar) and Gurdip Singh were found to have witnessed the GPA executed in favour of Kirpal Singh. Surjit Singh (Lambardar), Kuldeep Singh, Parwinder Singh and Advocate Rajesh Kumar are the witnesses to the sale deeds executed by accused Reeta Rani and Jaswinder Kaur.

iv) When the anticipatory bail petition of Reeta Rani was pending before this Court, it was noticed that the investigating officer had not even arrested the main accused Kirpal Singh and Jaswinder Kaur. Accordingly, both of them were arrested on 02.04.2025 at the intervention of this Court

9. From the above explanation, it becomes clear that the prime role, if any, in the commission of the offences in question was initiated at the instance of accused namely, Kirpal Singh, his wife Jaswinder Kaur, and Reeta Rani, who ultimately derived rights in the land due to the execution of the questioned sale deeds.

10. During the pendency of the anticipatory bail petitions—i.e., that of Reeta Rani (**CRM-M-64813-2024**) and that of Parwinder Singh and Jyoti (**CRM-M-64814-2024**)—by recording the contentions of these three petitioners, interim anticipatory bail was granted to accused Parwinder Singh and Jyoti vide order dated 20.12.2024, which reads as under:



“ *The petitioners seek grant of anticipatory bail in respect of a case registered vide FIR No.179, dated 3.12.2024 at Police Station Garhshankar, District Hoshiarpur, under Sections 319(2), 318(4), 336(2), 338, 336(3), 340(2), 61(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (BNS) (under Sections 419, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of Indian Penal Code).*

The FIR in question was lodged at the instance of Chander Shekhar Mehta, wherein it is alleged that his father, his ‘Taya Ji’ (elder uncle) and ‘chacha’ (younger uncle) had died long ago. It is alleged that their ancestral land has been sold to various persons on the basis of forged documents including Power of Attorney/ forged Aadhar Card etc. and mutation had also been got sanctioned in favour of Jaswinder Kaur wife of Kripal Singh. It is alleged that while Shri Brahm Saran Mehta (complainant’s uncle) had expired on 19.1.2006 in Delhi; another of complainant’s uncle namely Shri Shiv Saran Mehta had expired on 29.5.1996; complainant’s father Shri Krishan Chand Mehta had expired on 13.9.2008 and another of complainant’s uncle Shri Parhlad Narain Mehta had expired on 15.11.2020, whereas the sale deeds had been executed much after their death by way of impersonation or on the basis of some forged Power of Attorney, whereas any such Power of Attorney would lose its sanctity upon death of the executors. It is further alleged therein that Tehsildar Lakhwinder Singh, Registry Clerk Gurminder Singh, Deed Writer Sachin Kumar, Advocate, Surjit Singh Nambardar had all connived for the purpose of said fraud and that the sale deeds had been witnessed by Kuldeep Singh.

Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) submitted that the petitioners have falsely been implicated in the present case and that petitioner – Reeta Rani had purchased the land on the basis of sale deeds, which were duly registered in the office of Revenue Department and that in case there was any defect in the title or the seller had impersonated or had committed any fraud, she was not aware of the same and that she had purchased the property



by making payments and, as such, deserves to be given the benefit of doubt being a bona fide purchaser. It has also been submitted that as a matter of fact the land purchased by petitioner - Reeta Rani is a different piece of land and is not part of the ancestral property of the complainant and that her vendors are entirely different and there is nothing wrong in the sale deed executed in her favour.

Learned counsel while pressing upon the petition filed on behalf of petitioners – Parwinder Singh and Jyoti submitted that admittedly none of them is a beneficiary of the alleged fraudulent sale deeds and that they have been nominated as accused on the premises that they had signed as witnesses on the sale deeds. It has been submitted that merely witnessing a sale deed is not sufficient to attribute any fraudulent intention on the part of the petitioners and, as such, they deserve to be released on anticipatory bail.

Notice of motion for 14.01.2025.

Meanwhile, in the event of arrest, petitioners – Parwinder Singh and Jyoti be released on interim bail subject to his furnishing personal bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting/Investigating Officer. However, petitioners – Parwinder Singh and Jyoti 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 482 BNSS.

Petitioner – Reeta Rani shall furnish detailed information as regards her vendors and also as regards her source of income on the next date of hearing.

A copy of this order be placed on the file of connected case.”

Thereafter, said interim order was continued during all subsequent proceedings.

**CRM-M-64813-2024 and other connected cases****12**

11. On 21.03.2025, in the case of petitioner-accused Reeta Rani (CRM-M-64813-2024), although she was not directed to join the investigation, her arrest was stayed. Order reads as under:

“1. During the course of the hearing, it was understood from the respective counsels that the main accused, namely, Kirpal Singh, husband of Jaswinder Kaur, executed a fraudulent power of attorney in his own favour on 24.06.2024. In this power of attorney, one Jyoti was a witness, who in fact, is the daughter of one of the accused, Reeta Rani (the petitioner herein). Subsequently, as a power of attorney holder of original owners, Kirpal Singh executed two sale deeds, transferring the land in the name of his own wife namely Jaswinder Kaur, i.e. sale deeds dated 08.07.2024 (for 12 kanal 18 marlas) and 27.06.2024 (for 7 kanal 6 marlas)

2. Similarly, another sale deed was executed in favour of the accused, namely, Reeta Rani (petitioner herein), for 11 Kanal 14 Marlas, dated 15.07.2024. This sale deed was executed by projecting, as if, the actual owners have sold it in favour of Reeta Rani.

Notably, the mobile number 98789-37761 as mentioned in the sale deed, is the same number which is there in the sale deeds executed in favour of Jaswinder Kaur, also. However, learned counsel for the complainant, the learned State counsel, or the Investigating Officer present in court, are not in a position to explain, as to whom this mobile number actually belongs.

3. It has also been brought to the Court's attention that, till date, neither Jaswinder Kaur nor Kirpal Singh, who prima facie seems to be the actual conspirators, and also never have been granted bail, nor any substantive action has been taken by the Investigating Agency to arrest them. Court wishes to know and understand the reason behind this.

4. List again on 01.04.2025.



However, it is made clear that if the necessary legal steps are not taken before the next date of hearing, the concerned Senior Superintendent of Police would ensure his presence before this Court on the next date of hearing, to clarify the facts.

5. *In the meanwhile, petitioner - Reeta Rani shall not be arrested. However, question of joining of the investigation by the petitioner, would be examined on the next date of hearing.*

6. *Interim order dated 20.12.2024, passed in CRM-M-64814-2024, would also continue till the next date of hearing.*

7. *Let copy of this order be sent to the concerned SSP for necessary action."*

12. Vide order dated 04.04.2025 passed in CRM-M-64813-2024, CRM-M-64814-2024 and CRM-M-13686-2025, it was clarified that if accused Reeta Rani, Parwinder Singh, and Jyoti are required to join the investigation, they shall be served with prior notice, and any violation of this direction would be dealt with seriously.

Submissions on Behalf of Petitioners

Submission on Behalf of Petitioner Reeta Rani (CRM-M-64813-2024)

13. Mr. B.S. Khehar, learned counsel representing petitioner Reeta Rani, submitted that the petitioner-Reeta Rani purchased the land vide sale deed dated 15.07.2024 (P-3), measuring 11 Kanal 14 Marla 04 sarsahi, from its owners Malvi Devi Rani, Davinder Pal, Mohan Kumari, Sudarshana Kumari, Bihari Lal, Batali Ram, Janki Lal, Dina Nath, Viday Sagar, and Satguru Nath. However, the said land is not the same as that detailed in the FIR; therefore, being a different property, the petitioner cannot be termed an accused in relation to the allegations concerning the

**CRM-M-64813-2024 and other connected cases****14**

land mentioned in the FIR. Counsel further submitted that the sale consideration of about Rs.28,48,000 was duly paid after making the necessary arrangements, as evidenced by the notarized affidavit dated 11.01.2025 executed by Amrik Singh and Joga Singh. It was further argued that although, her arrest was stayed by this Court but the statement by the State counsel, alleging non-cooperation by the petitioner underscores her willingness to join the investigation, whereas she is always ready to do so.

Learned counsel broadly argued that whether the petitioner's purchase of the land constitutes a fraudulent transaction, is an issue which would be examined by the trial court on the basis of evidence, yet to be adduced before it.

14. With regard to the remaining two accused, namely Parwinder Singh and Jyoti, Mr. B.S. Khehar submitted that they are not direct beneficiaries of the alleged fraudulent transaction. Being merely witnesses to the sale deed, they are not required to undergo custodial interrogation. Any allegation against them is to be established through documentary evidence, and both the petitioners are always ready and willing to continue to cooperate during the investigation, whenever it is required. It was further pointed out that, in view of the interim order dated 20.12.2024, both Parwinder Singh and Jyoti have already been participated in the investigation.

Additionally, learned counsel argued that the sale deed executed in favour of Reeta Rani, which was witnessed by her co-

**CRM-M-64813-2024 and other connected cases****15**

accused Parwinder Singh and Jyoti, has since been cancelled, and the land has also been restored back in the names of the previous owners, no purpose would be achieved with the custodial interrogation of any of the petitioners.

Accordingly, counsel prayed for grant of the anticipatory bail to all the three petitioners namely Reeta Rani (in CRM-M-64813-2024), Parwinder Singh and Jyoti (in CRM-M-64814-2024).

Submission on Behalf of Petitioner Kamaljit Singh (CRM-M-20597-2025)

15. Mr. T.S. Chauhan, learned counsel representing petitioner Kamaljit Singh, submitted that the petitioner is employed as a Class-IV peon in the Tehsil Office, Garshankar, for approximately 20 years and was never found involved in any other similar activity in the past. His duty was limited i.e. to serve notices, in compliance with the order dated 06.09.2024, in connection with which he submitted his report. As per the record, no fault has been found in his functioning, except for the bald allegations mentioned in the reply/status report. Learned counsel emphasized that the petitioner cannot be considered a beneficiary in any manner of the alleged fraud committed by the other co-accused. Therefore, there is no gain attributed to him, and he should not be subjected to custodial interrogation. However, petitioner Kamaljit Singh has expressed his willingness to join the investigation if permitted, while protecting him from arrest.



Submission on Behalf of Petitioner Kirpal Singh @ Garpal Singh
(CRM-M-55567-2025)

16. Learned counsel representing petitioner Kirpal Singh @ Garpal Singh, aged 59 years, submitted that the case against the petitioner is false. The land in question was sold to his wife, Jaswinder Kaur, through a bank loan of Rs.12 lakhs. Had there been any motive to commit fraud for unlawful monetary gain or to grab land, there would have been no reason to borrow a bank loan. Any fake witnesses, if produced, were not at the petitioner's instance, but rather at the instance of other accused. It was further submitted that the witnesses were duly identified by the Lambardar and the attesting witness Kuldeep Singh; therefore, the petitioner could not have knowledge of the death of the original owners, as alleged in the FIR. Learned counsel further argued that the charges primarily depend on documentary evidence, and custodial interrogation would not serve any meaningful purpose. Moreover, the petitioner has been in custody for more than seven months and fifteen days, and nothing further remains to be recovered from him. Considering that the trial is likely to take considerable time, learned counsel prayed for the grant of regular bail.

Submission on Behalf of Petitioner Jaswinder Kaur w/o Kirpal Singh
@ Garpal Singh (CRM-M-36542-2025)

17. Ms. Simsi Dhir Malhthora, learned counsel representing petitioner Jaswinder Kaur, submitted arguments in the same terms as those addressed on behalf of petitioner-Kirpal Singh. It is further



submitted that, to protect her rights in the purchased land, the petitioner has filed Civil Suit No. CS-614/2024 on 08.01.2024, seeking a decree of declaration and permanent injunction. Until the said civil suit is decided, no definitive conclusion can be drawn regarding the allegations of fraudulent purchase of the land in question. Learned counsel further submitted that petitioner Jaswinder Kaur may succeed in the civil suit on the plea of being a bona fide purchaser even if fraud is proved, as the property was purchased through a bank loan of Rs.12 lakhs from Punjab National Bank. It is also submitted that the petitioner has been in custody since 02.04.2025, and any further incarceration would serve no meaningful purpose, as nothing more is to be recovered from her. Learned counsel prayed for the release of petitioner Jaswinder Kaur on regular bail by allowing the petition.

Arguments of Learned State Counsel

18. Learned State counsel, while opposing the prayer for bail on behalf of the respective petitioners, submitted that the role of each of the accused has been clearly delineated in the reply/status report filed by the State. Primary contention raised by learned State counsel is that during the investigation, it was found that at the time of registration of all the aforesaid sale deeds, as well as the preparation of the power of attorney by accused Kirpal Singh, only a single mobile number, i.e., 9878937761, was used, which is registered in the name of Rajwinder Kaur, daughter of Kirpal Singh.



Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Senior Deputy Advocate General, Punjab, submitted that the involvement of accused Kirpal Singh and his family members, including Jaswinder Kaur and Reeta Rani, appears to be evident. The fact that the same mobile number was mentioned in the execution of multiple documents indicates a premeditated act allegedly committed in collusion among them.

Learned State counsel further contended that custodial interrogation of accused Reeta Rani is necessary to ascertain the actual truth, as she succeeded in acquiring rights over a substantial portion of land measuring 11 Kanal and 14 Marla vide sale deed dated 15.07.2024.

Court Observation

19. I have carefully considered the submissions addressed by the respective counsel before this Court. I have also perused the pleadings, reply/status report, and the notes submitted during the course of arguments.

20. There can be any dispute that all the offences involved in the present case are triable by the Court of learned Magistrate. Apparently, the prime accused in this matter are Kirpal Singh and Jaswinder Kaur, who, according to the FIR, first caused a General Power of Attorney to be prepared in Kirpal Singh's name through impersonation by fictitious persons, and subsequently executed sale deeds in favour of Jaswinder Kaur. Both of them were arrested on 02.04.2025 and have since been in custody, having undergone investigation and interrogation by the



Investigating Agency for a period of approximately seven months and twenty days. At this stage, there is no justification for subjecting them to further custodial interrogation for the purpose of effecting any recovery, particularly as the trial is not likely to conclude in the near future and may take considerable time.

21. As regards petitioner Reeta Rani (CRM-M-64813-2024), although she had temporarily acquired rights in the property, Mr. B.S. Khehar, Advocate, has pointed out that the sale deeds in her favour have already been cancelled by the office of the Sub Divisional Magistrate vide order dated 23.09.2024. Learned State counsel could not explain as to how custodial interrogation of the accused would materially assist the prosecution, particularly when the allegations primarily require verification through documentary evidence. Records regarding Aadhaar cards, registered sale deeds, mutations, and Jamabandis, among others, are expected to be available in the concerned public offices.

Earlier arrest of petitioner Reeta Rani had been stayed; and vide order dated 01.04.2025, an opportunity was specifically provided to the State to summon her for investigation by serving proper notice. The relevant portion of the order reads as follows:

"5. It is also clarified that in case the accused named Reeta Rani, Parwinder Singh, and Jyoti are required to join the investigation, they should be served notice in advance, and any violation in that regard would be viewed seriously for taking strict action against the Chief of Police in the District."

**CRM-M-64813-2024 and other connected cases****20**

Accordingly, State continues to have the opportunity to examine the petitioner in connection with the investigation. It is also well-settled that custodial interrogation cannot be considered the sole method for conducting an investigation unless substantiated with specific reasons.

22. As far as petitioners Parwinder Singh and Jyoti (CRM-M-64814-2024) are concerned, this Court had already granted them the opportunity to join the investigation vide order dated 20.12.2024. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that both have complied with this direction and have actively participated in the investigation.

23. Regarding petitioner-Kamaljit Singh, he does not appear to be a direct beneficiary of the alleged fraud, still involvement is to be proved. Therefore, there appears to be no such necessity to subject him to custodial interrogation in the absence of any sound reason.

24. In the totality of circumstances, considering the role of each accused, all the aforementioned petitions are allowed in the following terms:

- i) CRM-M-55567-2025 – Kirpal Singh @ Garpal Singh**
- ii) CRM-M-36542-2025 – Jaswinder Kaur**

Petitioners Kirpal Singh @ Garpal Singh and Jaswinder Kaur are **ordered to be released on regular bail**, subject to their furnishing the requisite bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned

**CRM-M-64813-2024 and other connected cases****21**

Trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Illaqa Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned, provided they are not required in any other case.

iii)CRM-M-64813-2024 – Reeta Rani

iv)CRM-M-20597-2025 – Kamaljit Singh

Petitioners Reeta Rani and Kamaljit Singh, were protected from arrest vide orders dated 21.03.2025 and 21.04.2025, passed by this Court, which is continuing till date. They are directed to join the investigation within three weeks from today, or as and when required by the Investigating Agency upon issuance of a valid notice by the Investigating Officer. **In case they fail to do so, the concession of bail shall be deemed to have become inoperative.**

Upon joining the investigation and in case of their arrest, they shall be released on bail, subject to furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. Further they shall also comply with all conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

However, present order would be subject to the submission of their passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if they possess, within a period of one week from today. Otherwise, they would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that they do not possess any passport.

It is clarified that in case, aforesaid condition is not complied with, this order would be considered as *non est* automatically.

v) CRM-M-64814-2025 – Parwinder Singh and Jyoti



In this petition, **interim order dated 20.12.2024 is made absolute.** However, petitioners Parwinder Singh and Jyoti shall continue to **join the investigation as and when required** and shall strictly comply with the conditions envisaged under Section 482(2) of the BNSS, 2023.

However, present order would be subject to the submission of their passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if they possess, within a period of one week from today. Otherwise, they would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that they do not possess any passport.

It is clarified that in case, aforesaid condition is not complied with, this order would be considered as *non operative* automatically.

Accordingly, all petitions stand disposed of.

A photocopy of this order be placed on the files of other connected cases.

04.12.2025

Rashmi

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE**

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