



CRM-M-68728-2025

-1-

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

CRM-M-68728-2025

Date of Decision: 17.03.2026

Avtar Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Karan Bhardwaj, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr.Raj Karan Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in a case FIR No.84 dated 17.07.2024, registered under Sections 419, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B IPC, at Police Station Sulatanwind, District Amritsar.

2. Succinctly facts of the case are that FIR in the present case was lodged by the complainants, namely, Gurpreet Kaur, Sarabjit Singh and Gurcharan Kaur. It was alleged that they were owner in possession of the land and got raised the boundary wall of the land and also got installed a gate. Avtar Singh (petitioner) in connivance with the officials of Revenue Department, Tehsildar, Halka Patwari, Kanugo by producing false witnesses i.e., Lambardar Satnam Singh, Narinder Singh and Manpreet Singh in the absence of the complainants by producing some unknown ladies, who impersonated them and got registered three sale deeds in order to harm them and for their wrongful gain. The sale deeds were alleged to be not original. Thus, request was made to cancel the sale deeds and fake Intqals and to take legal action against the culprits. On the registration of the FIR, the



investigation commenced. The petitioner was arrested on 17.11.2024. He approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar, for the grant of regular bail. However, learned Court after hearing both the sides, finding no merit in the petition filed by the petitioner, dismissed the same vide order dated 19.12.2024. Earlier, the petitioner approached this Court by way of filing CRM-M-614-2025 and CRM-M-49437-2025, however, the same were dismissed as withdrawn/dismissed vide orders dated 07.08.2025 and 10.09.2025, respectively. Hence, aggrieved by the same, the petitioner is again before this Court by way of filing the present third petition.

3. It has been vehemently contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He contends that the petitioner is about 68 years of age. He submits that it is rather the petitioner, who has been cheated as he is the bonafide purchaser of the property. He submits that co-accused Satnam Singh has already been granted anticipatory bail by this Court vide order dated 27.05.2025. He contends that the investigation is complete and charges are framed. He further contends that the petitioner is behind the bars from the last more than one year. He further submits that though the petitioner was prosecuted in two other cases, however, he has been acquitted in those cases. He, thus, submits that in the overall facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioner deserves to be granted regular bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that the petitioner in a clandestine manner in connivance with the co-accused got the



property of the complainants transferred in his own name by way of impersonation. He submits that in place of the original owners, three co-accused were produced before the Revenue authorities and thus by impersonation, sale deed were executed. It is contended that the petitioner is the beneficiary of the sale deeds executed. However, on instructions, he submits that possession of the property in dispute is with the complainant only as on date. On instructions, he further submits that out of eight accused, four accused are yet to be arrested and out of 16 prosecution witnesses, 04 witnesses have been examined so far. He has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

5. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner was arrested in this case on 17.11.2024. Co-accused, who was the witness to the sale deeds has been released on bail. As per the arguments raised, possession of the property is with the complainant only. It has also been argued before this Court that for the cancellation of the sale deeds, the complainants have already filed civil suits, which are pending adjudication before the Civil Court. As per the custody certificate of the petitioner, he has completed incarceration of 01 year, 03 months & 23 days as on 16.03.2026. It further shows that the petitioner has been prosecuted in two other cases, however, he is on bail in one case.

6. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the

petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.
8. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

17.03.2026

sharmila

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)

JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned :

Whether Reportable :

Yes/No

Yes/No