

2026:PHHC:071827



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

102

CRM-M-25481-2026

Date of decision: 7th May, 2026

Jasbir Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. S.L. Chander Shekhar, Advocate for the petitioner.
Ms. Ruchika Sabherwal, Sr. DAG, Punjab.
Ms. R.K. Grewal, Advocate for the complainant.

MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL):-

The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No. 52 dated 13.03.2026 registered under Sections 420, 465, 468, 471, 120-B of IPC at Police Station Sultanwind, Police Commissionerate, District Amritsar.

2. As per the allegations, one Charan Singh was owner in possession of land comprised in Khasra No. 636 situated at village Sultanwind, Tehsil and District Amritsar on the basis of a sale deed dated 12.08.2015. He had sold the same to one Satwant Singh s/o Wariyam Singh. Satwant Singh further sold the land to the complainant Amrik Singh vide a registered sale deed dated 31.03.2023. In the past, there was a civil litigation with regard to this land, as the original owners Manjit Kaur and Ramandeep Kaur had executed agreement to sell dated 07.03.1994 in favour of Charan Singh but since sale deed was not executed in his favour, he filed a suit seeking specific

2026.PHHC.071827



performance of agreement. The said suit was decreed. During the pendency of the said suit, Manjit Kaur and Ramandeep Kaur had executed sale deed in respect of the same property in favour of the present petitioner on 13.02.1995. The said sale deed was also set aside. However, the petitioner-accused with ill intention executed an agreement to sell, this property in favour of Ramandeep Kaur.

3. As per the further allegations, the above said Ramandeep Kaur filed a civil suit claiming right over the same property on the basis of agreement to sell dated 02.06.2022 executed by the petitioner. The suit so filed was dismissed. Even the appeal and regular second appeal were also dismissed. However, the petitioner with intent to defraud and cheat the complainant agreed an anti-dated agreement to sell in his favour and on the basis of the said agreement got executed an amended sale deed dated 20.05.2005 on the ground that the khasra number of the land which he purchased was 634 and not 636. On the basis of that amended sale deed, he got mutation qua land bearing khasra No. 636 entered in his name. Though he had no ownership either over land bearing khasra No. 636 or 634. By alleging that the petitioner had done so to cheat and to cause wrongful loss to the complainant, he prayed for taking action in the matter. After registration of the FIR, investigation proceedings have been initiated and are underway. Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner moved an application for grant of pre-arrest bail before the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar, which was dismissed vide order dated 28.04.2026.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been

2026.PHHC.071827



falsely implicated in this case. The FIR has been lodged as to a counter blast to the civil litigation that was initiated by the petitioner and to exert pressure upon him. His antecedents are clean. He is ready to join the investigation. His custodial interrogation is not required. The entire case rests upon the documentary evidence which is in custody of investigating agency. As such, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

5. Notice of motion.

6. Learned State counsel has advance notice of the petition and is ready to argue the matter. At this stage, Ms. R.K. Grewal, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of the complainant. Learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant has argued that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. For conducting thorough and proper investigation in the matter, custodial interrogation of the petition is must. No exceptional or extraordinary circumstance has been made out in favour of the petitioner for grant of anticipatory bail. Therefore, it is stressed that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

7. This Court has heard the rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties at considerable length.

8. The petitioner in connivance with the co-accused Ramandeep Kaur is alleged to have prepared a forge document of sale of the disputed property by claiming right over the same. He is also alleged to have managed change of land bearing Khasra No. 636 to 634 in the sale deed, which was registered in his favour by getting it amended. The said sale deed has since been set aside. However, despite that, the petitioner had executed an

2026.PHHC.071827



agreement qua the property actually belonging to the complainant obviously with intent to cheat him. For the purpose of conducting thorough and proper investigation in the matter, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is must. The powers of anticipatory bail are extra ordinary and the same are to be exercised sparingly and in exceptional circumstances. The Court must be circumspect while exercising such power for grant of anticipatory bail and it should not be granted as a matter of rule and has to be granted only when the Court is convinced that exceptional circumstances exist to resort to that extra ordinary remedy. In the present case, no such exceptional circumstances warranting exercise of the powers for grant of anticipatory bail by this Court are existing. Keeping in view the gravity of allegations as levelled against the petitioner and the attendant facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petition does not deserve to be allowed. Accordingly, the same is dismissed.

9. It is, however, clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

10. Since the main petition has been dismissed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

7th May, 2026
Parveen Sharma

1. Whether speaking/ reasoned	:	Yes / No
2. Whether reportable	:	Yes / No