



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

102

CRM-M-25261-2025
Decided on: 25.02.2026

Mahinder Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Bhupinder Kumar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Mitul Singh Rana, Advocate for the complainant.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name & age of Petitioner (s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Mahinder Singh	96	30.05.2023	420 IPC	Mukerian	Hoshiarpur

2. As per the allegations, a written agreement was executed in the presence of witnesses, and pursuant to the said agreement, possession of a portion of the land was handed over to the complainant, Joginder Singh, after the petitioner allegedly received an amount of ₹6 lakhs.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, as per the allegations, 2 acres of land are stated to have been sold by the petitioner to the complainant for a consideration of only ₹6 lakhs. Counsel further

**CRM-M-25261-2025****2**

contends that, in fact, no such transaction ever took place, nor could any such amount have been received, as the land in question is owned by the Forest Department.

Elaborating on his arguments, learned counsel further submits that the complainant himself was not in a position even to get the title transferred in his name, since the land belongs to the Forest Department. It is also argued that there is no evidence to show that any amount was paid to the petitioner through any bank transaction. Moreover, in compliance with the directions issued by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 12.05.2025, the petitioner joined the investigation on 01.07.2025. Thus, he prays for confirmation of the interim anticipatory bail order.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel submits that the petitioner has already joined the investigation; however, no amount allegedly received by him in the year 2017 has been recovered.

5. Mr. Mitul Singh Rana, learned counsel for the complainant, submits that the petitioner is a habitual offender, having been involved in four other cases. The details of the said cases are as follows:

“a. FIR No. 125/30.07.2022, under sections: 447,201,186,511,506 of IPC, sections 32 & 33 of Indian Forest Act, 1927 and sections 2 & 9 of Wild Life (Protection) Act, 1972, PS:Mukerian.

b. FIR No. 0156/20.09.2022, under sections: 353,186,506, 447, 511 & 427 of IPC, sections 32 & 33 of Indian Forest Act, 1921 and sections 2,9 & 51 of Wild Life (Protection) Act, 1972, PS:Mukerian.

c. FIR No. 167/22.10.2022, under sections: 341,201,379 &



107 of IPC and sections 32 & 33 of Indian Forest Act, PS: Mukerian.

d. FIR No. 172/07.11.2022, under sections: 379,427,201,447,353 & 186 of IPC and sections 32,33 & 63 of Indian Forest Act, 1927 and Sections 2,9 and 51 of Wild Life (Protection) Act, 1972, PS Mukerian.”

6. Responding to the same, learned counsel for the petitioner clarifies that in all four cases, the final reports were submitted as “untraced,” and, therefore, complainant appears to be under a misconception regarding the petitioner’s involvement in other cases. Moreover, petitioner is not aware of any such cases pending against him.

7. Learned State counsel submits that, as per instructions, petitioner is not involved in any other case.

8. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the paper-book.

9. It is worth noticing that the four other cases referred to above originate from Police Station Mukerian, and petitioner is seeking anticipatory bail in the instant case, which was also registered at Police Station Mukerian, District Hoshiarpur. Had there been any other case pending against the petitioner, it would not have been expected from the Investigating Officer or the concerned Police Station to leave the petitioner unarrested, as there is no protection order qua those cases in the name of the petitioner.



CRM-M-25261-2025

4

Since petitioner has already joined the investigation, ad-interim bail granted by this Court on 12.05.2025 is hereby made absolute. Accordingly, present petition is allowed.

However, petitioner shall continue to join the investigation as and when required to do so and abide by all the terms and conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

However, present order would be subject to the submission of his passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses, within a period of one week from today. Otherwise, he would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport.

It is clarified that in case, aforesaid condition is not complied with, this order would be considered as non est automatically.

10. Accordingly, petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

25.02.2026
Rashmi

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO
Whether Reportable: YES/NO