

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-40594-2025 (O&M)
DECIDED ON: 27.02.2026

KULVIR SINGH.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.

Present: Mr. Navjot Singh, Advocate, *(through VC mode)*,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Jasraj Singh, Advocate, for the complainant.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J (ORAL)

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
Kulvir Singh, aged about 62 years	86	07.06.2025	318(4) of BNS	Mahilpur	Hoshiarpur

2. After hearing counsel for the petitioner, on 30.07.2025, following order was passed by this Court:-

“2. On oral request made by counsel for the petitioner, complainant namely Onkar Singh, s/o Pritem Singh, Post office Lalwan, Hoshiarpur

(Punjab), is ordered to be impleaded as respondent No.2 in the present petition.

Let amended memo of parties be supplied by counsel for the petitioner in the Registry, within a period of two days from today, without moving any separate application.

3. *Learned counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, contends that original owner of the land was one Darshan Singh, who executed a General Power of Attorney (GPA) dated 08.04.2009, in favour of the petitioner, which was subsequently cancelled on 11.10.2010. However, petitioner was never informed about the cancellation of the said GPA.*

3. *It is further submitted that executor of the GPA, Darshan Singh, expired on 13.06.2014, a fact which was also unknown to the petitioner. Acting under bona fide belief, the petitioner sold the land to the complainant, Onkar Singh, and received an amount of Rs.8,25,000/- from him.*

4. *Counsel for the petitioner further submits that to amicably resolve the dispute, petitioner is willing to repay the amount paid by the complainant for the purchase of the land and seeks permission to join the investigation, while seeking protection from arrest. Thus, prays for grant of concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the present case.*

5. *Notice of motion.*

6. *On advance notice, Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab, puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent – State, and Mr. Jasraj Singh, Advocate, puts in appearance on behalf of the complainant/respondent No.2.*

7. *Counsel for the complainant refutes the contention made by counsel for the petitioner, by submitting that petitioner, being nephew (bhanja) of the deceased, cannot be expected to have been unaware of the death of his maternal uncle. However, the complainant is willing to accept the proposal put forth by the petitioner's counsel for an amicable settlement of the dispute.*

8. *Accordingly, present matter is referred to Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court for settling the dispute between the parties.*

9. *Let the petitioner and the complainant namely Onkar Singh appear before the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court on 12.08.2025.*

10. *List again on 15.09.2025, awaiting report.*

11. Till the next date of hearing before this Court, petitioner shall not be arrested. However, issue of joining of investigation by the petitioner would be examined on the next date of hearing."

3. Although, petitioner was afforded an opportunity to resolve the dispute amicably before the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court, but the proceedings did not yield any fruitful outcome.

4. Today, while continuing his submissions, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is willing to pay back the amount to the complainant; however, he seeks a period exceeding six months to do so.

5. On being asked by this Court, it has been pointed out that the original owner of the property, namely Darshan Singh, was the maternal uncle (*mama*) of the present petitioner.

6. In view of such a close familial relationship, contention raised by learned counsel for the petitioner that petitioner had no knowledge of the cancellation of the transaction or death of his maternal uncle, namely Darshan Singh, does not inspire confidence and appears *prima facie* unbelievable.

7. In these circumstances, this Court does not find any substantial ground to extend the extraordinary relief of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the present case. **Accordingly, present petition stands dismissed.**

8. However, Investigating Officer is directed to proceed in accordance with law.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

27.02.2026
Lavisha

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No