



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

**CRM-M No.26623 of 2026
Date of decision: 14.05.2026**

Manjit Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU

Present :- Mr. Manish Verma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sahil Chowdhary, AAG, Punjab
for the respondent-State.

Mr. Tarun Deora, Advocate
for the complainant.

MANDEEP PANNU, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition is the first petition filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (corresponding Section 438 Cr.P.C.) seeking grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.247 dated 19.11.2024, registered under Sections 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 448 and 120-B IPC, 1860 (corresponding Sections 318(4), 336(2), 338, 336(3), 340(2), 329(4) and 61(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023), at Police Station Sadar, Police Commissionerate, Ludhiana, Punjab.

2. As per the allegations in the FIR, complainant Vishal Gupta alleged that he had purchased certain plots in Geetika Valley Colony, Sangowal, Ludhiana and had raised construction thereupon. It was alleged



that accused Tejinderpal Singh, who was known to the complainant and was dealing in property matters, was entrusted with the work relating to sale of flats and supervision of certain properties. The complainant alleged that taking advantage of the said relationship, accused persons prepared forged partnership deeds, agreements and other documents by allegedly tracing and fabricating signatures of the complainant and Vijay Kumar in order to claim rights in the property and flats. It was further alleged that one flat was sold to present petitioner Manjeet Singh for an amount of Rs.8,60,000/- and possession thereof was delivered without authority and in connivance with co-accused persons. On the basis of the complaint moved by Vishal Gupta, an inquiry was conducted by the police authorities and thereafter, recommendation was made for registration of the present FIR under Sections 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 448 and 120-B IPC.

3. During inquiry, the police compared the disputed agreements and partnership documents with the admitted signatures and letterheads of the complainant and other concerned persons. The inquiry report recorded that the disputed agreement/letter pad allegedly used by accused persons did not match the original letterhead of the complainant, as the format, GST particulars, mobile number and other details materially differed from the genuine documents. It was also noticed that certain agreements did not bear signatures of purchasers/witnesses and original documents were not produced despite opportunity. Statements of Vijay Kumar and other persons were also recorded, wherein allegations were made that signatures appearing on certain agreements appeared to have been traced/copied from other documents. On the basis of the aforesaid discrepancies and suspicion



regarding authenticity of signatures and documents, the matter was recommended to be sent for forensic examination and ultimately, the FIR came to be registered against the accused persons. It is further averred that learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ludhiana vide order dated 16.04.2025 had granted anticipatory bail to the present petitioner-Manjeet Singh as well as co-accused Tejinderpal Singh in FIR No.247 dated 19.11.2024 registered under Sections 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 448 and 120-B IPC at Police Station Sadar, Ludhiana. While granting the concession of anticipatory bail, learned Court imposed a specific condition that the bail shall remain subject to the outcome of the FSL report regarding the signatures of the complainant on the disputed documents and in case the report revealed that the signatures were forged and fabricated, the investigating agency would be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail for the purpose of further investigation. Thereafter, an application for cancellation of bail was moved by the prosecution on the ground that the FSL report had been received and the questioned signatures, when compared with the admitted/specimen signatures, showed material dissimilarities and no similarities could be found between them. The Court, while relying upon the FSL report, observed that the signatures of the complainant appeared to be forged on the disputed documents and further custodial interrogation of the accused persons was required to ascertain the manner in which the forged documents had been prepared and the involvement of other persons therein. Consequently, vide order dated 06.04.2026, the anticipatory bail granted to Manjeet Singh and co-accused Tejinderpal Singh was cancelled.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the impugned



order dated 06.04.2026 cancelling the anticipatory bail granted earlier vide order dated 16.04.2025 is wholly illegal and unsustainable in law, as the same virtually amounts to reviewing the earlier order granting bail, which is impermissible under Section 362 Cr.P.C. (now Section 403 BNSS). It is submitted that the petitioner had been granted anticipatory bail with full knowledge that the FSL report regarding the disputed signatures was awaited and no condition of bail as contemplated under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C. had ever been violated by the petitioner. It is further argued that mere receipt of an adverse FSL report does not constitute any supervening circumstance warranting cancellation of bail, particularly when there is neither any allegation of misuse of concession of bail nor interference with the course of investigation or justice. Learned counsel also submits that the liberty granted to the investigating agency to seek cancellation of bail was only procedural and could not confer power upon the Court to reassess the merits of the case or review its earlier order in the absence of any misconduct on the part of the petitioner. It is further contended that the FSL report has not been appreciated in its correct perspective and the same is not conclusive evidence of forgery. Learned counsel further submits that the report is merely an expert opinion under Section 45 of the Indian Evidence Act and handwriting expert evidence is only advisory in nature requiring independent corroboration. It is argued that even the FSL report does not conclusively establish that the disputed signatures marked as Q8 are forged and no definite opinion has been given with regard to the same. Learned counsel further submits that there are no allegations of forgery specifically attributed to the present petitioner and the dispute essentially



pertains to possession of the flat/property, which is civil in nature. It is also submitted that the petitioner had already instituted a civil suit titled “*Manjeet Singh versus Vishal Gupta and another*” seeking injunction and related reliefs regarding the suit property. Learned counsel further argues that incorrect and unrepresentative specimen signatures were allegedly forwarded by the investigating agency to the FSL for comparison and the admitted signatures of the complainant, according to the petitioner, closely resemble the signatures appearing on the disputed agreement to sell. On the basis of the aforesaid submissions, prayer has been made for setting aside the impugned order and for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel assisted by counsel for the complainant has opposed the present petition and submitted that the anticipatory bail granted to the petitioner and co-accused Tajinder Pal Singh was rightly cancelled by learned lower Court. It is contended that while granting anticipatory bail vide order dated 16.04.2025, a specific condition had been imposed that in case the FSL report regarding the disputed signatures revealed that the signatures of the complainant on the questioned documents were forged and fabricated, the investigating agency would be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail for further investigation. It is submitted that after receipt of the FSL report, the questioned signatures were found dissimilar to the standard/specimen signatures of the complainant and significant divergences in writing characteristics and line quality were noticed. Accordingly, the prosecution moved an application for cancellation of bail and learned lower Court, keeping in view the FSL findings and the requirement of custodial interrogation to ascertain the



manner in which the forged documents were prepared and the persons involved therein, rightly cancelled the anticipatory bail of the petitioner.

6. This Court has considered the rival submissions addressed by learned counsel for the parties and has gone through the record with their able assistance. A perusal of the order dated 16.04.2025 reveals that anticipatory bail was granted to the petitioner and co-accused Tajinder Pal Singh subject to a specific condition that in case the FSL report regarding the disputed signatures came to the conclusion that the signatures of the complainant on the questioned documents were forged and fabricated, the investigating agency would be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail for the purpose of further investigation. Thus, the concession of anticipatory bail granted to the petitioner was itself conditional and was dependent upon the outcome of the FSL examination. Thereafter, upon receipt of the FSL report, the investigating agency moved an application for cancellation of bail and learned lower Court, after considering the said report, found that the questioned signatures did not tally with the standard/specimen signatures of the complainant and material dissimilarities in writing characteristics and line quality were noticed. Once such condition, on the basis of which protection had earlier been granted, stood breached on account of the adverse FSL report, learned lower Court cannot be said to have committed any illegality in cancelling the anticipatory bail granted earlier to the petitioner.

7. Apart from the above, the allegations levelled in the FIR are also serious in nature. The allegations are not confined merely to a simple property dispute, rather there are specific allegations regarding preparation



and use of forged agreements/documents, cheating and unlawful retention of the flat in question. The investigation, at this stage, is still required to ascertain the manner in which the questioned documents were prepared, the persons involved therein and the role played by each accused. The plea raised on behalf of the petitioner that the dispute is purely civil in nature cannot be accepted at this stage in view of the specific allegations of forgery and fabrication supported by the FSL report. Custodial interrogation of the accused cannot be ruled out in the facts and circumstances of the present case.

8. Consequently, finding no merit in the present petition, the same is hereby dismissed.

9. However, nothing observed herein shall be construed as an expression on the merits of the case.

10. All pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

14.05.2026
neetu

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

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