

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-73470-2025
DECIDED ON: 05.03.2026

KALA BANSALPETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJABRESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.

Present: Mr. V.P. Singh, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Naveen Sharma, 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
Kala Bansal, aged about 33 years	0148	13.08.2025	82 of Registration Act and 319(2), 318(4), 336(2), 338, 336, 340(2) and 61(2) of BNS	Salem Tabri	Ludhiana

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, as per the allegations, there existed a plot bearing No.140 measuring 100 square yards, situated at Village Bhora Abadi, Amar Nagar, District Ludhiana, in the name of one Sham Lal. It is alleged that one person, namely

Gurmukh Singh, impersonated the said Sham Lal (original owner of the plot), and executed a sale deed dated 27.11.2020 in favour of Vasdev Singh. Thereafter, on 25.10.2023, on the strength of the said sale deed, Vasdev Singh further sold the said plot to the complainant – Pradeep Kumar.

Another accused, namely Ajit Singh, again impersonated Sham Lal and executed a second sale deed dated 11.10.2024, in respect of the same plot in favour of Jagseer Singh and Baljeet Singh. On the strength of the said sale deed, the same plot was subsequently sold to another person, namely Kuldeep Singh, vide sale deed dated 21.01.2025.

3. Counsel for the petitioner contends that petitioner is merely a marginal witness to the sale deed dated 21.01.2025, and none of the parties to the said sale transaction has been found to be fake or to have impersonated any other person. Allegation against the petitioner that he had been conspiring since the execution of the sale deed dated 27.11.2020 in favour of Vasdev Singh is wholly unfounded, as the petitioner was neither a signatory nor a witness to any of the earlier sale transactions prior to the sale deed dated 21.01.2025.

4. Learned counsel further submits that co-accused, namely Shastri, in whose favour a General Power of Attorney dated 14.09.2020 was purportedly executed by the executant-Sham Lal, has already been granted the concession of anticipatory bail by this Court, vide order dated 25.02.2026 passed in CRM-M-52167-2025. Thus, counsel prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the present case.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel as well as counsel for the complainant, while opposing the prayer for anticipatory bail made by the petitioner, jointly submit that petitioner has been involved in a conspiracy with Vasdev Singh since the very beginning and, therefore, he is not entitled to the concession of anticipatory bail.

It is further submitted that petitioner is a property dealer in the area and is allegedly involved in execution of the documents relating to plots owned by other persons, wherein, by impersonating the actual owners of such plots, fake sale deeds are executed.

However, despite a specific query raised by the Court, neither learned State counsel nor counsel for the complainant was able to cite any instance of the petitioner's involvement in any similar activity in the past.

6. This Court has heard the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties and has also perused the record available before it.

7. Considering the nature of allegations levelled against the petitioner and the fact that his involvement is yet to be established, and further that the question as to whether petitioner had any motive or derived any benefit from the alleged transactions, is a matter to be examined during the course of trial, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the present case.

8. Accordingly, present petition is allowed, and petitioner is directed to join the investigation within two weeks from today, or as and

when called by the investigating agency, and in the eventuality of the arrest, petitioner would be released on anticipatory bail, subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall also be abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.).

9. Besides, it is directed that petitioner would hand over his passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses. Otherwise, would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport.

It is also directed that before leaving country any time during trial, petitioner would seek prior permission of the Court.

10. With the directions issued here above, present petition stands disposed of.

05.03.2026

Lavisha

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>