

2026:PHHC:087895



-1-

204 + 218

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

CRM-M-24058-2026 (O&M) WITH
CRM-M-27846-2026

Date of Decision: 22.06.2026

1. CRM-M-24058-2026

AMARJIT SINGH

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

2. CRM-M-27846-2026

PAWAN MAHAJAN

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PARMOD GOYAL

Present: Mr. Vaibhav Sehgal, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-24058-2026.

Mr. Vishnu Dutt, Advocate
for the petitioner (through VC) in CRM-M-27846-2026.

Dr. D.S. Lamba, Addl. A.G. Punjab.

PARMOD GOYAL, J. (ORAL)

Petitioners Amarjit Singh and Pawan Mahajan have sought grant of regular bail under Sections 483 of Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in case arising out of FIR No.9 dated 28.07.2022 (Annexure P-1) under Sections 7, 7A, 8, 12, 13(2) of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 and Section 316(5), 318(4), 338, 340(2), 61(2) of Bhartiya Nyaya

Sanhita, 2023 read with Sections 65, 66, 66-C, 66-D of Information and Technology Act, 2000, registered at Police Station Vigilance Bureau, District Ludhiana.

2. As per above noted FIR, case of investigating agency/prosecution was that one plot bearing no.114-D measuring 125 sq. yds. was allotted in favour of Jagroop Singh in the year 1999 and allotment letter was yet to be issued to him. The said Jagroop Singh had died in the year 2020 and accused in connivance with Kuljeet Kaur, Ex. Chairman, Improvement Trust and other employees of Improvement Trust who are also accused in the present FIR along with other accused namely Gagandeep Goyal and others succeeded in reviving the allotment in favour of Jagroop Singh by preparing his forged Aadhaar Card and by impersonating Jagroop Singh who had since died. The allotment letter was got in the name of impersonator Jagroop Singh and thereafter impersonator Jagroop Singh had transferred the said plot further and for said purposes Kuljeet Kaur had taken Rs.10,00,000/- as bribe, out of which Rs.4,00,000/- was kept by her and Rs.4,00,000/- were paid to Ex-Chairman and Rs.1,00,000/- each was shared by Sandeep Sharma, PA and Rs.1,00,000/- was taken by Gagandeep Goyal who got death certificate of Jagroop Singh and copy of his Aadhaar Card from his family on the pretext of getting the allotment revived in favour of LRs of Jagroop Singh.

3. During investigation present petitioners and one Shivam Arora were also found involved in getting the allotment letter by way of impersonation. It is the case of investigating agency that it was Shivam Arora who had impersonated Jagroop Singh and had entered into an

agreement to sell in favour of Harjot Kaur and has received earnest money of Rs.5,11,000/- for sale of said plot prior to such impersonation. Reliance has been placed upon said agreement to sell executed by Shivam Arora which was witnessed by present petitioners Amarjit Singh and Pawan Mahajan and on the basis of said agreement, investigating agency has concluded that present petitioners were also involved in getting the allotment letter by impersonating Jagroop Singh and then selling it on three occasions.

4. Learned counsel for petitioners has argued that they have been falsely implicated. It is argued that at no point of time they had identified Shivam Arora as Jagroop Singh and even the alleged agreement to sell relied upon by investigating agency was in the name of Shivam Arora and not by Jagroop Singh. Learned counsel has further argued that challan has since been filed, however, trial has been stayed by this Court for want of sanction against the co-accused. It is asserted that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioners in the custody as trial is likely to take time.

5. Bail applications are opposed by learned counsel for State on the ground that involvement of petitioners is clearly made out from the investigation and duly described in the charge-sheet. It is asserted that if petitioners are released on bail, they are likely to abscond and delay the trial.

6. Admittedly, in the present case, co-accused Kuljeet Kaur has already been granted bail.

7. On consideration of allegations against the petitioners as well as material placed against petitioners in the shape of agreement to sell executed by Shivam Arora in favour of Harjot Kaur (Harjot Kaur had not signed the said agreement), I do not find any justification to keep the petitioners in the

custody as trial is likely to take time in view of the facts and circumstances of the present case.

8. As far as case of Shivam Arora is concerned, his case is different from that of Amarjit Singh and Pawan Mahajan as allegations against him is as regards to the fact that it is he who had impersonated Jagroop Singh. The role of petitioners is not similar to Shivam Arora who is stated to be in custody.

9. Accordingly, let petitioners be released on bail on furnishing bail bonds in the sum of Rs.1,00,000/- with two sureties in the like amount to the satisfaction of learned Trial Court/Duty Officer.

10. Both the petitions are allowed in above terms.

11. Pending application(s), if any, is/are disposed of accordingly.

22.06.2026
chiranjeev

(PARMOD GOYAL)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No