



275

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

CRM-M No.27368 of 2026

Date of Decision: 20.05.2026

Santokh Singh Khosa**..... Petitioner****Versus****State of Punjab****..... Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ*********

Present: Mr. Gaurav Vir Singh Behl, Advocate;
Mr. Jugraj Singh Chouhan, Advocate and
Mr. Sagar Bansal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Raj Karan Singh, Asstt. A.G., Punjab.

*********RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J.**

1. Present second petition has been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.07, dated 11.01.2023, under Sections 419, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 & 120-B of IPC, registered at Police Station City Zira, District Ferozepur.

2. Succinctly, the facts of the case are that FIR in the present case was got registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Sant Gangan Dass, Power of Attorney of Samruti widow of Pardeep Chaudhary. It was alleged that Pardeep Chaudhary was the owner of land measuring 92 Kanal 5 marla, share 72/427 in 555 kanal 02 marla in khewat No.122 as per Jamandabi 2013-2014 in the area of village



Pandori Khatrian, Tehsil Zira and he was murdered on 10.12.2014 at Sahibabad, District Ghaziabad and in this regard, FIR No.2157, dated 10.12.2024 was also registered at Police Station Indirapuram, District Ghaziabad. It was alleged that after the death of Pardeep Chaudhary, his legal heirs are his family, i.e. wife, namely, Samruti, daughters, namely, Nidhi Chaudhary and Unati Chaudhary and son, namely, Rudraksh Chaudhary. It was alleged that on 06.09.2016, Harjinder Kaur, Sant Baba Bihla Dass Chela Garib Dass, Pardeep Singh, Inder Singh, **Santokh Singh, i.e. the petitioner**, in connivance with each other by impersonating one other person, namely, Pardeep Chaudhary had executed the sale deed in favour of co-accused, namely, Harjinder Kaur by preparing a forged and fabricated sale deed of Pardeep Chaudhary. It was further alleged that on 18.05.2017, Harjinder Kaur in connivance with other co-accused, namely, Ravinder Jit Singh, Gurvir Singh and Pardeep Singh had prepared one forged sale deed and got executed the same in the name of Ravinder Jit Singh and the same was registered in the office of Tehsildar on 19.05.2017. It was further alleged that the accused prepared the forged sale deed and entered the same in the revenue department by cheating and playing fraud with the complainant and to cause mischief to her and her children. Thus, the request was made to take legal action against all the accused. On the basis of the same, FIR was registered. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. Resultantly, the petitioner was arrested on 21.08.2025. On completion of the investigation, the challan was presented and on framing of the



charges, the trial commenced. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Fast Track Court, Exclusively Dealing with Rape Cases, Ferozepur praying for the grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ferozepur declined the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 28.11.2025. Being aggrieved, the petitioner earlier approached this Court praying for the grant of regular bail by way of filing CRM-M-71036-2025, however, the same was dismissed as not pressed vide order dated 19.03.2026. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner is again before this Court praying for the grant of regular bail by way of filing the present second petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He has submitted that nothing has been recovered from the possession of the petitioner. He has submitted that as per the case of the prosecution, the only allegation against the petitioner is that he, in connivance with other co-accused by impersonating had executed the sale deed in favour of co-accused, namely, Harjinder Kaur by preparing a forged and fabricated sale deed of Pardeep Chaudhary (since deceased). He has submitted that the petitioner is not the beneficiary of the sale deed. He has further submitted that the dispute in the present case is of civil nature, which has been given a colour of criminal nature. He has submitted that there is no direct or indirect evidence against the petitioner to connect him with the commission of offence. He has submitted that the petitioner is behind



bars from last more than 08 months. He has submitted that the challan has been presented and the charges have also been framed in the present case. To buttress his arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents as he has never been involved in any other case. He has relied upon the decision passed by this Court in '**Paramjeet Kaur vs. State of Punjab**', CRM-M-65526-2025, decided on 08.05.2026. He has submitted that in the facts and circumstances, the petitioner deserves to be granted regular bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the State, however, has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that name of the petitioner has been specifically mentioned in the FIR. He has submitted that the petitioner is the master mind of the offence committed as he, in connivance with other co-accused, by impersonating, had prepared a forged sale deed of Pardeep Chaudhary, who had already expired on 10.12.2014, and has executed the same in favour of one Harjinder Kaur. He has further submitted that co-accused, namely, Harjinder Kaur in connivance with other co-accused got executed the same sale deed in favour of Ravinderjit Singh, who has further sold some of the land to one Bhupinder Kaur (wife of co-accused, namely, Bihla Dass) on 19.05.2017, wherein present petitioner, namely, Santokh Singh, has signed the deed as a witness whereas the other part of the land was sold to Kuldip Kaur, who is sister-in-law of the petitioner (wife of co-accused, namely, Surender) wherein the petitioner has signed the deed instead of the purchaser. He has



submitted that the role of the petitioner in the present case has been specifically established as he is the beneficiary. He has further submitted that the challan has been presented and charges have also been framed in this case. He has submitted that the allegations of fraud allegedly made against the petitioner are serious in nature. He has further submitted that the petitioner was also declared as proclaimed offender vide order dated 01.04.2024. He has further submitted that no case for the grant of bail to the petitioner is made out and thus, the present petition deserves to be dismissed. He has produced custody certificate of the petitioner today in the Court, which is taken on record.

5. Heard.

6. Perusal of the record would show that when this Court was not inclined to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner, his first bail petition bearing CRM-M No.71036 of 2025 was dismissed as not pressed vide order dated 19.03.2026. Hence, this is the second petition praying for the grant of regular bail, however, there is no change in the circumstances.

7. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the complicity of the petitioner in the present case has been *prima facie* established. The allegations against the petitioner have been specifically found that the petitioner is the master mind, who by hatching a criminal conspiracy with other co-accused, had prepared a forged sale deed of Pardeep Chaudhary, who already expired on 10.12.2014, and further executed the same in favour of Harjinder



Kaur, who executed the same in favour of co-accused, namely, Ravinderjit Singh. Thereafter, Ravinderjit Singh further sold the land to two persons, namely, Bhupinder Kaur and Kuldip Kaur, in which the petitioner has signed the deed as a witness as well as purchaser, respectively. The petitioner is also found to be the beneficiary of the same. There are sufficient evidence against the petitioner, which strengthens his complicity in the commission of the said offence.

8. The judgment relied upon by learned counsel for the petitioner is distinguishable from the facts and circumstances of the present case.

9. Keeping in view the above said position, this Court does not find any ground to release the petitioner on bail at this stage. Hence, the present second petition is hereby dismissed.

10. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

20.05.2026

rittu

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE