

2026:PHHC:032279



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

103

CRM M-52522-2024
Date of Decision : 27.02.2026

Gurnam SinghPetitioner(s)
Versus
State of PunjabRespondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE N.S.SHEKHAWAT

Present:- Mr. A.S. Barnala, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. M.S. Bajwa, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Manu Loona, Advocate for
Mr. Harpreet S. Multani, Advocate
for the complainant.

N.S.SHEKHAWAT (Oral):

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 with a prayer to grant pre-arrest bail to him in case FIR No.54 dated 04.08.2024 registered under Sections 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 384 and 120-B of IPC at Police Station Block Majri, District SAS Nagar (Mohali).
2. During the course of arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner has referred to para number 13 of the reply submitted by learned State counsel, which reads as under:-

“That as per the preliminary inquiry conducted, the role of petitioner Gurnam Singh is that he alongwith Navdeep Singh after the execution of Sale Deed and handing over the possession, started blackmailing complainant to give them more money because they got him the land at very cheap rate and if he will not give them money then they will file a complaint in regard to stamp duty against the complainant. That upon which, complainant Sehajdeep Singh came to know that the copy of agreement to sell which they have attached with the application is forged and does not bear his signatures and only his name is written and there are signatures of Gurnam Singh Numberdar as witness. Thus, by preparing a forged agreement to sell and submitting the same before the authority, petitioner/accused committed fraud upon complainant and further blackmailed him for more money in regard to the land which he purchased”.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that from the aforesaid stand taken by learned State counsel also, it is apparent that the petitioner had only signed the copy of the petition as a witness, and was not beneficiary of the transaction in any manner. He further submits that even the complainant is son of a retired Chief Secretary of Punjab, and he is using his connections to harass the petitioner and other rustic villagers. Even, the villagers have filed a civil suit, in which a status quo order has been passed regarding the construction work being carried out by the complainant. He further contends that the petitioner was granted the concession of interim anticipatory bail on 22nd of October 2024, and he has been joining the

investigation for the last more than one year and four months. He further submits that he has cooperated with the investigating agency in the present case and his custodial interrogation may not be required.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer made by the learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that there are serious allegations against the petitioner and the petitioner is not entitled for the concession of regular bail. Learned State counsel further submits that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required for recovery of the original agreement to sell in the present case.

5. Learned counsel for the complainant also submits that the petitioner has committed a serious fraud and does not deserve the concession of bail.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

7. It is not in dispute that the petitioner was granted the concession of interim anticipatory bail on 22nd of October 2024, and he has repeatedly joined the investigation. Even, the State has been unable to explain as to how an attested witness could be in possession of an agreement to sell, and in the considered opinion of the Court, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner may not be required.

8. Without commenting any further on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is granted

concession of anticipatory bail, subject to the conditions as provided under Section 482(2) of the B.N.S.S. It will be open for the Investigating Officer to call the petitioner to join investigation, if so required, by issuing a written notice in this regard and he shall abide by the conditions mentioned in Section 482(2) of the B.N.S.S.

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

27.02.2026
amit rana

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