



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

Sr. No.107

CRM-M-66240-2025
Date of Decision:09.03.2026

SARABJIT KAUR

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU

Present:- Mr. Nippun Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sahil Chowdhary, AAG, Punjab.

MANDEEP PANNU, J. (Oral)

1. This is the first criminal miscellaneous petition under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking the concession of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 0032 dated 08.04.2021 registered under Sections 419, 420, 465, 467, 471 read with Section 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Navi Baradari, District Jalandhar, Punjab.

2. Briefly stated, the present FIR has been registered on the complaint of Balbir Kaur wife of Gurdial Singh, an NRI, alleging that she is the owner of about 180 marlas of land situated at Krishanpura near Ajit Nagar, Bajria. It is alleged that the complainant came to know through her acquaintance Sukhwant Singh that one Simranjit Singh had paid earnest money through cheques for purchase of the said property, though the complainant had neither agreed to sell the said land nor had she received any



such payment. Upon inquiry, it surfaced that during the time when the complainant was residing in America, Narinder Singh had arranged a lady who impersonated the complainant Balbir Kaur and on the basis of a forged general power of attorney dated 01.06.2020 got the land sold in favour of Sunita Duggal for a sum of ₹33 lakhs. It is further alleged that the said power of attorney was attested with the involvement of other accused persons and thereafter the property was fraudulently transferred. According to the prosecution, the present petitioner Sarabjit Kaur, along with co-accused including Narinder Singh @ Nindi and others, was part of the conspiracy and facilitated the execution of the forged documents and illegal sale of the property. On the basis of these allegations, the present FIR has been registered against the accused persons under Sections 419, 420, 465, 467, 471 and 120-B of the IPC.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is argued that the petitioner has not been named in the FIR and no specific overt act or role has been attributed to her. Neither the alleged power of attorney nor the sale deed bears the signatures of the petitioner in any capacity. It is further submitted that as per the prosecution version, the main allegations are against Narinder Singh, husband of the petitioner, who allegedly arranged a lady to impersonate the complainant Balbir Kaur for execution of the forged documents, and the said impersonating lady Gurjeet Kaur has already been arrested by the police. Learned counsel submits that merely because the petitioner is the wife of the co-accused Narinder Singh,



she is being unnecessarily harassed by the investigating agency. It is further argued that the petitioner is a household woman with clean antecedents and is not involved in any other criminal case. The petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation and has also expressed her readiness to give her specimen signatures and thumb impressions for comparison by the handwriting expert and FSL. It is contended that no recovery is to be effected from the petitioner and her custodial interrogation is not required. On these grounds, prayer has been made for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. Learned State counsel has opposed the present petition and submitted that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature and pertain to a well-planned conspiracy involving impersonation, forgery and fraudulent transfer of immovable property. It is argued that the investigation conducted so far has revealed that the present petitioner Sarabjit Kaur was actively involved in the commission of the offence. As per the prosecution case, the petitioner impersonated the complainant Balbir Kaur and executed documents in furtherance of the conspiracy whereby a forged power of attorney was prepared in favour of her husband Narinder Singh and thereafter the property belonging to the complainant was fraudulently sold. Learned State counsel submits that the material collected during investigation indicates that the petitioner had played a pivotal role in facilitating the impersonation and execution of forged documents, which ultimately resulted in wrongful loss to the complainant. It is further contended that the investigation is still at a crucial stage and the custodial



interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for effective investigation, particularly to ascertain her precise role in arranging the impersonator, facilitating the forged power of attorney and participating in the illegal property transaction. It is also submitted that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner would be necessary to confront her with the co-accused and to recover relevant documents and digital evidence pertaining to the forged property transaction and to unearth the full extent of the conspiracy. Learned State counsel has further submitted that if the petitioner is granted anticipatory bail at this stage, it may adversely affect the investigation and there is a likelihood that she may influence or intimidate material witnesses. On these grounds, prayer has been made for dismissal of the present petition.

5. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, this Court is of the considered view that the petitioner is not entitled to the concession of anticipatory bail. The allegations in the present case pertain to a serious offence involving impersonation and fabrication of documents in respect of valuable immovable property belonging to the complainant. As per the prosecution case, while the complainant was residing abroad, the accused persons conspired to prepare a forged power of attorney by impersonating the complainant and on the basis of the said forged document, the property in question was fraudulently sold. The role attributed to the present petitioner is not merely peripheral but specific in nature. The investigation suggests that the petitioner impersonated the complainant Balbir Kaur and participated in the preparation of the forged power of attorney in favour of her husband Narinder Singh, which



subsequently facilitated the illegal transfer of the complainant's property. Such allegations disclose a deliberate and calculated act of fraud and forgery causing substantial loss to the complainant.

6. It is also pertinent to note that the investigation is still underway and the matter involves multiple accused persons and forged documents. The custodial interrogation of the petitioner appears to be necessary for effective investigation, particularly for confronting her with the co-accused, verifying the circumstances surrounding the impersonation and forged documents and for recovery of relevant material evidence connected with the fraudulent transaction. At this stage, when the investigation is continuing and the prosecution case involves serious allegations of conspiracy, forgery and cheating in relation to immovable property, this Court does not find it appropriate to extend the extraordinary relief of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Moreover, the material witnesses in the case are yet to be examined and the possibility of the petitioner influencing or interfering with the investigation cannot be ruled out if she is granted the concession of pre-arrest bail.

7. Considering the gravity of the allegations, the specific role attributed to the petitioner in impersonating the complainant and facilitating the forged power of attorney and the stage of investigation, this Court is of the view that no ground is made out for grant of anticipatory bail. Consequently, the present petition filed by the petitioner Sarabjit Kaur is dismissed.



- 8. However, nothing observed herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.
- 9. All pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

09.03.2026
Anu

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

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