



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

105

CRM-M-72009-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 19.12.2025

Moolchand

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Haryana

...Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Divyam Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Vikram Singh, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

This first petition has been filed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.604 dated 31.12.2024 registered under Sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station City Palwal, District Palwal.

2. FIR in the present case was registered on the complaint sent by Tehsildar, Palwal to the Superintendent of Police, Palwal. The same reads thus:-

“Subject:- Regarding registration of FIR in relation to registration of Wasika No. 10109 dated 28.12.2023 on the basis of fake conveyance deed of Khasra No. 34//23/1, (5-8) Waka Mauza Patli Khurd and authority letter bearing the signature and seal of Tehsildar (Sales), Faridabad. On the above subject, the undersigned has come to know from reliable sources that conveyance deed No. 10109 of Khasra No. 34//23/1 (5-8) Waka

Mauza Patli Khurd Tehsil and District Palwal was registered on 28.12.2023. But it has been learnt that the signature of Sub-Tehsildar (Sales) Faridabad is fake on this conveyance deed and authority letter. The said conveyance deed has been done in collusion and conspiracy by the presenter Shri Amit Aadhar number 471502563819 son of Shri Mohan Singh resident of 45, SGM Nagar, NIT, Faridabad and the buyer Shri Bandhan Bir Singh son of Shri Kanwar Bir Singh Kabli resident of House No. 45, Shiv Colony, Karnal (Haryana) and witnesses Arjun Nambardar and Moolchand. Therefore, 201 of this case should be registered and investigated and strict action should be taken against the culprits. Tehsildar, Palwal. The investigation of the complaint was carried out by ASI Narendra Singh EOW CELL. During the investigation, according to the letter number 220-T.F. dated 13.06.2024, 408-30T.F. dated 11.12.2024 of Tehsildar Sale Faridabad, the land area of Patali Khurd has not been sold by the department nor has conveyance deed/sale deed been issued. Which is on the basis of fake documents Lalit son Omprakash and Madhubala wife Lalit resident near Gulab Singh School Dukadia Mohalla Palwal District Palwal, cousin brother-in-law Dinesh of Sundar Singh son Nanak Chand resident of Pachvati Colony Palwal, real brother-in-law Babli of Sundar Singh son Nanak Chand resident of Panchvati Colony Palwal, Sundar Singh son Nanak Chand resident Pachvati Colony Palwal, Arjun son Prabhati resident

Maheshpur Tehsil and District Palwal, Mulchand son of Nanakchand, resident of Pachavati Colony, Palwal, Mamchand Nambardar, with the intention of causing harm to the government and to get personal benefit, in connivance with each other, prepared fake letter number 715-622/TSF dated 12.09.2023 719-228/TSF and dated 28.12.2023 and in collusion with Sale Deed No. 10109 dated 28.12.2023, 10942 dated 19.01.2024, 11291 dated 02.02.2024 were prepared in Tehsil Palwal. There is a need for a thorough investigation regarding the said complaint. Therefore, orders should be given to the manager police station city Palwal to register a case under section 419, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120B of Indian Penal Code on the complaint. The report is now available. SDNARENDERSINGH ASI Economic Offenses Branch dated 16.12.2024 after advice and order of officers registered case complaint no. 1565-5P dated 05.04.2024 on receipt of mail at police station case no. 0604 based on crime 419 420 467,468,471,120 B. After registering in police station city Palwal, copies of the FIR are being prepared by CCTNS computer and are being sent to Bajaria post in the service of the area magistrate and officer Bala. The fake police complaint and the original complaint filed by SPO Jagdish 61/Palwalke Nijd I/O Economic Offenses Wing are being sent.”

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is not a beneficiary of the transaction in question. It is contended

that the petitioner had merely acted as an attesting witness to the Conveyance Deed No. 10109 dated 28.12.2013 and had no role whatsoever in the execution of the document or deriving benefit arising therefrom. It is further submitted that the mutation sanctioned on the basis of the said conveyance deed stood cancelled prior to the registration of the FIR. Therefore no loss have occasioned as a consequence of the said conveyance deed. It is also submitted that it was the principal accused, namely Amit and Lalit, who had impersonated their identity and procured the conveyance deed in their own favour. Counsel contends that the said co-accused/Lalit was arrested and has since been enlarged on regular bail vide order dated 18.11.2025 passed by this Court in CRM-M-21303-2025 titled *Lalit v. State of Haryana*. He submits that no recovery is to be effected from the petitioner and hence, his custodial interrogation is wholly unwarranted.

4. I have heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner and have gone through the documents appended with the instant petition with their able assistance.

5. It remains undisputed that a forged conveyance deed in respect of custodian property was executed in favour of a fictitious person, namely Bandhan Bir Singh, who was, in fact, impersonated by the co-accused Lalit. Likewise, the purported seller shown in the said conveyance deed, namely Babli, was in fact impersonated by the co-accused Amit. The record further discloses that the petitioner was not merely an attesting witness to the execution of the said conveyance deed, but had also identified the persons concerned at the time of its execution.

6. Further, the signatures of the Sub-Tehsildar (Sales), appearing

on the conveyance deed as well as on the authority letter, were also forged. The entire transaction was carried out in collusion between the presenter, namely Amit, the purchaser Bandhan Bir Singh and in collusion with the Nambardar as well as the petitioner herein. The mere subsequent cancellation of the mutation entered on the basis of the said conveyance deed, by itself, does not obliterate the criminal liability attributable to the petitioner.

7. The act attributed to the accused persons, including the petitioner, of seeking to perfect title over custodian land through the execution of fraudulent and forged documents constitutes a grave and serious offence. Forgery of signatures of the Govt. Official viz. Sub-Tehsildar (Sales) on the conveyance deed as well as authority letter reflect a criminal mind in tandem with criminal acts where all players were impersonators. They even succeeded in getting the mutation sanctioned in their favour. This shows the meticulous detailing gone into by the petitioner herein. Once the signatures of Sub-Tehsildar (Sales) were themselves forged, it cannot be assumed that the petitioner had appeared before a competent authority under any *bona fide* belief. In view of the nature and magnitude of the allegations and the manner in which the offence has been committed, I am of the opinion that the petitioner does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

8. It is well settled that the grant or refusal of anticipatory bail does not hinge solely on the question as to whether any recovery is to be effected from the accused. The Court is duty-bound to take into account the nature and gravity of the offence, the role attributed to the accused and the

manner in which the offence has been committed. Where the allegations reveal a planned, deliberate and carefully executed crime involving impersonation, forgery and collusion, such factors assume decisive relevance while adjudicating a plea for anticipatory bail. In such circumstances, insulation against custodial interrogation cannot be extended as a matter of course, more-so when the allegations indicate a concerted design to defraud public authorities and usurp public property.

9. Upon a careful consideration of the record and the submissions advanced, I am of the opinion that the circumstances which could possibly indicate that the petitioner is an innocent victim of the situation are conspicuously absent in the present case. On the contrary, what emerges *prima facie* is the existence of a well-orchestrated and premeditated scheme, conceived and executed with deliberation, involving the creation of forged and fabricated documents, the use of false and fictitious identities and the affixation of forged signatures to lend legitimacy to an otherwise unlawful transaction. Thus, finding no merit, the present petition is dismissed.

10. ***Ordered accordingly.***

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

19.12.2025

Mangal Singh

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