



CRM-M-24140-2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

217

CRM-M-24140-2026
Decided on : 14.05.2026

Gurpreet Singh

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and another

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present : Mr. Kulwinder Pal Kaur Gill, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Manjinder Singh Bhullar, DAG Punjab

Mr. Akshay Mittal, Advocate
for respondent No. 2

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Gurpreet Singh, aged 48 years	322	04.07.2025	420, 465, 468, 471, 120-B IPC (now Sections 318(4), 336, 336(3), 340, 61 of BNS)	Zirakpur	SAS Nagar (Mohali)

2. FIR has been registered on the basis of complaint moved by complainant Anil Verma, Director of Kala Realtech Private limited company , Connaught Place, Delhi to the effect that company is the lawful owner of the land

**CRM-M-24140-2026**

located at Zirakpur, Mohali village Nabha, Tehsil Dera Bassi, District SAS Nagar. The purchase of this land was financed through a loan from the financial institution IFCI. The said property is currently under a legal dispute at the Debt Recovery Tribunal, Delhi where an order has been passed restraining the company and the Tehsildar from selling or transferring the proeprty. The said property was previously attached by CBI in another case. On 1.06.2025, Gurpreet Singh alongwith muscle men attempted to forcibly occupy the premises in question. Their unlawful attempt was thwarted and the police was called. Gurpreet Singh claimed that he had executed an agreement to sell by Surinder Singh in his favour and had already filed civil suit in court at Dera Bassi. Thereafter, they made inquiries from the court and obtained the copies of the said case and was surprised to see that Surinder Singh in collusion with Gurpreet Singh, Sukhwinder Singh and other persons has fraudulently created fake documents of board resolution dated 09.01.2024 of the company and prepared an agreement to sell of the valuable property of the company. No such resolution has ever been passed by the company. The said resolution is a forged and fabricated document. The above said property has been pruchased by the company in the year 2011 for approximately 16 crores where as in fraudulent agreement to sell the sale price is mentioned as Rs. 4 crore. So, all the accused with common intention to grab the valuable property of the company has forged the document.

3. Allegation against the petitioner is that he, along with other co-accused, hatched a conspiracy and forged a resolution of the company, wherein complainant-Anil Verma, and Surinder Singh, were shown as Directors. On the basis of the said forged resolution, an agreement to sell in respect of the company's property was executed.

**CRM-M-24140-2026**

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that as per allegation, the petitioner entered into an agreement to sell as a purchaser with seller of the property Surinder Singh, who alleged to have forged a resolution of the Company, wherein complainant-Anil Verma and co-accused Surinder Singh were shown as Directors. On the basis of said forged resolution, an agreement to sell dated 13.03.2024 in respect of the Company's property was executed. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that infact the allegations are false rather it is the petitioner, who has spent and issued three cheques total amounting to Rs. 70 lacs, therefore, the allegation that he is the actual beneficiary is neither here nor there. Thus, prays for grant of bail.

5. Learned State counsel and counsel for the complainant submit that it was primarily the petitioner and his co-accused Surinder Singh, who hatched conspiracy being member of *land mafia*, therefore, petitioner being the recipient of the property is actual beneficiary, therefore, he does not deserve any concessional relief, such as coming out of the jail on bail. Both the learned counsel are *ad idem* to the issue that there were three cheques total amounting to Rs. 70 lacs and none of them were got encashed.

6. This Court has heard the submissions addressed by learned counsel for the parties and has carefully perused the record available before it.

7. All the offences are triable by the Court of Magistrate and the charges required to be proved more on the basis of documentary evidence, whatever could be collected during investigation or during interrogation, with all possibility that might have been completed by the concerned investigating officer. One of the main accused Surinder Singh has already been granted anticipatory bail vide order dated 01.05.2026 passed in CRM-M-21103-2026. In view of the fact that



CRM-M-24140-2026

petitioner is inside jail for the last 03 months and the offences are triable by the Court of learned Magistrate, this Court deems it appropriate to extend the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

8. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

9. The observation made here-in-above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.

10. It is further made clear that if, in future, petitioner is directly found indulged in similar kind of activities, this order shall be deemed to be cancelled.

11. Petition stands disposed of.

Pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

May 14, 2026

reena

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

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE**