



CRM-M-15301 of 2026

-1-

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

233

CRM-M-15301 of 2026

Date of Decision: 06.04.2026

Rajiv Aggarwal

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present: Ms. Divya Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Shukla, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Kamalpreet Singh, Advocate for the complainant.

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the instant petition filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in case FIR No.30 dated 02.06.2025 registered under Sections 406, 420 and 120-B of IPC (Sections 419, 465, 467, 468 and 471 of IPC added later on), registered at Police Station Division No.1, District Ludhiana.

2. Brief facts of the present case as per the prosecution are that the petitioner in connivance with co-accused executed a sale deed by impersonating vendor Ajit Singh. Hence, present FIR was lodged.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. She submitted that the alleged agreement to sell is of dated 07.09.2018 and the FIR in



question was registered on 02.06.2025 i.e. after an unexplained delay of more than 06 years, casting serious doubt on the prosecution story. She argued that the petitioner was granted the concession of anticipatory bail by the learned trial Court, vide order dated 25.06.2025. Thereafter, the investigating agency added an offence of forgery and impersonation in the FIR and consequently, his bail was cancelled. She further argued that on 12.02.2026, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ludhiana dismissed his anticipatory bail application. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that since earlier the petitioner was enlarged on anticipatory bail but later on the same was dismissed only after adding of new sections of forgery and impersonation, thus, she prays that present petition be allowed.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the prayer for grant of bail on the ground that the petitioner has also committed the offence of forgery and impersonation and thus, his bail was cancelled. Hence, he does not deserve any relief. However, he could not controvert the fact that the petitioner is no longer required for investigation.

5. 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.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties at length and after perusing the record of the case, it is evident that the petitioner was admitted to bail by the learned trial Court, vide order dated 25.06.2025, but the same was dismissed later on due to addition of new sections in the FIR.

7. In the peculiar facts of the present case, since the petitioner had earlier joined the investigation and regularly appeared before the trial

**CRM-M-15301 of 2026****-3-**

Court; the learned counsel for state has stated that his custodial interrogation is no longer required; the culpability of the petitioner is a matter of trial; hence, this Court is taking a lenient view.

8. In view of the above, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/CJM concerned.

9. It is clarified that nothing stated herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

06.04.2026*D.Bansal*

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