

**CRM-M-19355-2025****CRM-M-22554-2025** **2**

No.0024, dated 13.02.2025, under Sections 318(4), 61(2) of BNS, registered at Police Station Samrala, Khanna, District Ludhiana.

Petition, i.e. CRM-M-22554-2025 is filed by the petitioner – Jaspal Singh, seeking grant of anticipatory bail, in case, FIR No.0024, dated 13.02.2025, under Sections 318(4), 61(2) of BNS and sections 338, 336(3), 340(2) of BNS added later on, registered at Police Station Samrala, Khanna, District Ludhiana.

3. As per the allegations, petitioner-Kulwinder Singh, who is neither the owner nor in possession of the land in question, approached Harbhajan Singh and Vinay Garg in August 2024 and offered to facilitate the sale of land situated in village Manupur in their favour, through his relative, Harjinder Singh. Thereafter, in November 2024, petitioner introduced the complainants to Harjinder Singh.

Both the complainants are property dealers. A deal was struck for the sale of land measuring 48 acres, owned by Harjinder Singh and his family members, at a consideration of Rs.55 lakhs per acre. At the time of execution of the agreement, an amount of Rs.52 lakhs was paid as earnest money.

4. It is further alleged that one of the co-sharers of the land is Ram Singh, and petitioner Jaspal Singh forged his signatures in the agreement to sell by impersonating him.

5. In paragraph No.5 of the status report dated 21.05.2025 filed by learned State counsel in CRM-M-19355-2025, details regarding the amounts paid by the complainants have been furnished.

**CRM-M-19355-2025****CRM-M-22554-2025** **3**

6. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that, to the best of their knowledge, no civil suit has been filed by the complainants for enforcement of the agreement to sell. It is contended that complainants, being property dealers, are attempting to give a criminal colour to what is essentially a civil dispute in order to exert pressure.

7. It is further argued that the dispute pertains to a transaction involving 6 acres of land (48 kanals) at the agreed rate of Rs.55 lakhs per acre, and partial payments were allegedly made to the actual owners of the land. As per the status report, a cheque bearing No.00040 dated 25.11.2024 for an amount of Rs.2 lakhs was paid to Kulwinder Singh by Satish Kumar, which, in all likelihood, may have been encashed by the actual owner.

It is also alleged that petitioner-Jaspal Singh received cash payments totaling Rs.6 lakhs on 25.11.2024 and 21.12.2024. However, in the absence of any documentary proof, the said petitioner disputes the receipt of any such amount.

8. This Court has heard the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties and perused the record available on file.

9. It is an admitted position that transaction was entered into by the complainants, who are property dealers, with the actual owners of the land. Petitioners do not appear to be direct beneficiaries of the transaction, nor they were the holders of any power of attorney authorizing them to represent the owners.



CRM-M-19355-2025
CRM-M-22554-2025 4

10. Upon a specific query put by the Court, learned counsel for the complainants was unable to confirm whether any civil suit has been filed for enforcement of the agreement to sell.

11. In view of the above, this Court does not find any substantial reason to subject the petitioners to custodial interrogation. Accordingly, both the present petitions are allowed.

12. Both the petitioners, namely Kulwinder Singh and Jaspal Singh are directed to join the investigation within two weeks from today, or as and when called by the investigating agency, and in the eventuality of the arrest, petitioners would be released on anticipatory bail, subject to their furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The petitioners shall also be abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.).

13. Besides, it is directed that petitioners would hand over their passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if they possess. Otherwise, would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that they do not possess any passport.

 It is also directed that before leaving country any time during trial, petitioners would seek prior permission of the Court.

14. Accordingly, both the petitions stand disposed of.

15. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of other connected case.

20.03.2026
Lavisha

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>