



CRM-M-11655 of 2026 -1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

341

CRM-M-11655 of 2026
Date of Decision: 12.03.2026

Kamaljit Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present: Mr. S.S. Swaich, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Rahul Jindal, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Sparsh Chhibber, Advocate for the complainant.

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.18 dated 24.01.2026 registered under Sections 419, 465, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of IPC, at Police Station Dirba, District Sangrur.

2. Brief facts as per the prosecution case are that the petitioner in connivance with other co-accused, got transferred the land on 30.03.2006 by impersonation. Hence, the present FIR.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and he has no connection with the alleged fraud. He further submitted that the alleged transfer deed was registered on 30.03.2006 but the FIR in question was



CRM-M-11655 of 2026 **-2-**

registered on 24.01.2026 i.e. after an unexplained delay of 20 years, casting serious doubt on the prosecution story, which is not sustainable in the eyes of law. He argued that the petitioner and the complainant are the real brothers and it is a family dispute. He submitted that the petitioner and the complainant jointly purchased land for Rs.9 lakhs, vide sale deed dated 10.04.2006 with the sale proceeds of their land sold by the aforesaid sale deed dated 30.03.2006. He further submitted that even otherwise, the dispute in the present case is civil in nature, which has been given criminal colour by lodging the present FIR. He further submitted that the entire case is based on documentary evidence which are already in possession of the complainant or the investigating agency, hence, nothing is to be recovered from the petitioner. Moreover, the petitioner has clean antecedents as he is not involved in any other case. No recovery is to be effected from the petitioner. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submitted that the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation as and when called upon to do so by the investigating agency. Hence, he prays that present petition be allowed.

4. After registration of the FIR, investigation has been initiated and is under way. Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner had moved an application for grant of anticipatory bail which has been dismissed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sangrur, vide order dated 16.02.2026.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed the status report in the matter, which is taken on record and while referring to the same, he has opposed the prayer of the petitioner for grant of anticipatory bail on the ground that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in



CRM-M-11655 of 2026 **-3-**

nature. He argued that the petitioner is specifically named in the FIR. He further argued that the petitioner in connivance with other co-accused, got registered the sale deed dated 30.03.2006 before Rupinder Manku, the then Sub Registrar, Dirba through co-accused Nirmal Singh who represented himself as complainant Swaran Singh, by forging the signatures of Swaran Singh and succeeded to get the sale deed registered and as such, he has actively participated in the crime. He further submitted that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required to ascertain the modus operandi adopted by him; to trace the money trail and to recover the cheated and misappropriated amount. Hence, he prays for dismissal of the petition.

6. Learned counsel for the complainant adopts the submissions made by learned State counsel and while opposing the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner, has contended that the petitioner has played an active role in the crime and thus, does not deserve the concession of bail.

7. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the material available on record, this Court is not inclined to grant the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. The allegations levelled in the FIR are grave and specific in nature, wherein the petitioner has been named as an active participant in the commission of the alleged offence. As per the prosecution case, the petitioner, in connivance with the co-accused, is alleged to have facilitated the execution and registration of the impugned sale deed by impersonation and by forging the signatures of the complainant, thereby causing wrongful loss to the complainant and corresponding gain to himself. The investigation in the present case is still at a nascent stage and the custodial interrogation of the petitioner appears to be necessary for unearthing



CRM-M-11655 of 2026 -4-

the complete modus operandi adopted in the commission of the alleged fraud, tracing the money trail and for effecting recovery of the cheated amount. The material on record at this stage prima facie indicates towards the existence of a bigger syndicate indulging in dubious activities as a result of which, innocent victims end up being preyed upon by such illusory tactics. While considering the plea for grant of anticipatory bail, this Court is required to consider the overall nature of offence and accusations against the accused, the manner of occurrence, the gravity of offence and the potential impact of granting pre-arrest protection to the petitioner, at this stage. Granting anticipatory bail to the petitioner with such allegations, at this preliminary stage, would not be justified as it may affect the course of fair investigation and undermine the seriousness of the alleged act. Considering the gravity of the allegations, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for effective investigation in the matter.

8. It is befitting to mention here that while considering a plea for grant of anticipatory bail, the Court has to equilibrate between safeguarding individual rights and protecting societal interest(s). The Court ought to reckon with the magnitude and nature of the offence; the role attributed to the accused; the need for fair and free investigation as also the deeper and wide impact of such alleged iniquities on the society. It would be apposite to refer herein judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in '*State Vs. Anil Sharma*', (1997) 7 SCC 187, wherein it has been held as under:

"6. We find, force in the submission of CBI that custodial interrogation is qualitatively more elicitation-oriented than questioning a suspect who is well-ensconced with a favourable order under Section 438 of the Code. In a case like this, effective



interrogation of a suspected person is of tremendous advantage in disinterring many useful information and also materials which would have been concealed. Success in such interrogation would elude if the suspected person knows that he is well protected and insulated by a pre-arrest bail order during the time he is interrogated. Very often interrogation in such a condition would reduce to a mere ritual. The argument that the custodial interrogation is fraught with the danger of the person being subjected to third degree methods need not be countenanced, for, such an argument can be advanced by all accused in all criminal cases. The Court has to presume that responsible police officers would conduct themselves in a responsible manner and that those entrusted with the task of disinterring offences would not conduct themselves as offenders."

9. Further, the Hon'ble Supreme Court, in case titled as "**P. Chidambaram v. Directorate of Enforcement**", (2019) 9 SCC 24, while dealing with economic offences, has held that the power of anticipatory bail should be sparingly exercised in economic offences. The relevant portion of the judgment is reproduced as under:-

*"77. After referring to Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre and other judgments and observing that anticipatory bail can be granted only in exceptional circumstances, in **Jai Prakash Singh v. State of Bihar**, the Supreme Court held as under: (SCC p.386, para 19)*

"19. Parameters for grant of anticipatory bail in a serious offence are required to be satisfied and further while granting such relief, the court must record the reasons therefor. Anticipatory bail can be granted only in exceptional circumstances where the Court is prima facie of the view that the applicant has falsely been enroled in the crime and would not misuse his liberty".



Economic Offences

78. Power under Section 438 CrPC being an extraordinary remedy, has to be exercised sparingly; more so, in cases of economic offences. Economic offences stand as a different class as they affect the economic fabric of the society. In **Directorate of Enforcement v. Ashok Kumar Jain**, it was held that in economic offences, the accuse is not entitled to anticipatory bail.

XXX XXX XXX

83. Grant of anticipatory bail at the stage of investigation may frustrate the investigating agency in interrogating the accused and in collecting the useful information and also the materials which might have been concealed. Success in such interrogation would elude if the accused knows that he is protected by the order of the court. Grant of anticipatory bail, particularly in economic offences would definitely hamper the effective investigation. Having regard to the materials said to have been collected by the respondent Enforcement Directorate and considering the stage of the investigation, we are of the view that it is not a fit case to grant anticipatory bail”.

10. Accordingly, this Court finds no merit in the present petition in the factual matrix of the case in hand. Moreover, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for effective investigation and if it is denied, it will leave many loose ends, which is not desired. Thus, the present petition being devoid of merits is accordingly dismissed.

11. It is made clear that nothing said hereinabove shall be deemed to be an expression of opinion upon merits of the case.

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

12.03.2026
puneet

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