



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

118

Date of decision: 23.02.2026

(1) CRM-M-72861-2025

DALJIT SINGH ALIAS KALAPetitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANARespondent

(2) CRM-M-71464-2025

SAHIL SHARMAPetitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANARespondent

(3) CRM-M-510-2026

SETHI LALPetitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANARespondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. G.S. Kaura, Advocate with
Mr. Dhruv Trehan, Advocate,
Ms. Shubhkarman Kaur Kaura, Advocate,
Mr. Amanpreet Singh Dhiman, Advocate and
Mr. Rangat Joshi, Advocate

for the petitioner in CRM-M-72861-2025.

Mr. Rahul Vohra, Advocate and
Ms. Sonali Aggarwal, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-71464-2025.

Mr. Arihant Jain, Advocate and
Mr. Rishav Jain, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-510-2026.

Ms. Chhavi Sharma, Asstt. A.G. Haryana.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

All these three petitions arising out of the same FIR are being decided by a common order. While CRM-M-72861-2025 has been filed on behalf of Daljit Singh @ Kala seeking concession of pre-arrest bail, CRM-M-510-2026 and CRM-M-71464-2025 have been filed by Sethi Lal and Sahil Sharma respectively for grant of regular bail.

2. The FIR in the present case has been registered on the complaint of Ranjodh Sund residing at 113 Wallbrook Road, Derby, DE23 8SF, UK. The same reads thus:-

"I am a retired Police officer of the UK Police Department and son of deceased Mehnga Ram Sund, currently residing at 113 Wallbrook Road, Derby, DE23 8SF, UK, having Email Id: ranj.sund@sky.com want to bring the following criminal acts against my property to your immediate and kind attention:- 1. My father, Mehnga Ram Sund was owner and in possession of plot number 102 p sector 2, measuring 450 square yards situated at urban estate, Panchkula Haryana. That my father Mehnga Ram breathed his last on 8th August 2012. 2. After his death I being one of the surviving legal heirs of my father was in possession of the house since 2012 3. Since I have been residing in U.K. I appointed my

aunt Shindo as caretaker of the above-mentioned house. I used to visit the house whenever I visited India and use to stay in the house during that period. The neighbours are all well aware of this and know these facts as we had cordial relations with everyone around in the locality. 4. my father's name i.e., Mehnga Ram Sund is reflecting in the records of Haryana Shehri Vikas Pradhikaran (HSVP) department. This plot was allotted by HUDA in name of my father (deceased) Mehnga Ram Sund on 04.04.1996. 5. Mehnga Ram Sund died intestate and we his legal heirs are his natural successors to his property 6. I through my representatives went to the office of HSVP, Panchkula for getting my name entered with regard to the house in question and to my shock and dismay, it came to my knowledge that one Rohit Kumar is claiming himself to be owner of the house in question on the basis of a Will dated 10.09.2008 purported to have been executed by Mehnga Ram Sund. This man is neither related to us in any manner nor his identity is known to anyone in the family. 7. I had cordial relations with my father and I was also serving my father during his old age and had all the love and affection for him. My father, had no reason to Will his property to any third random person. My father, Mehnga Ram Sund never executed any Will dated 10.09.2008 in favour of the Rohit Kumar. 8. Since I with all my siblings and their families are residing at UK therefore taking undue advantage of our absence this Rohit Kumar seems to be trying usurp our property through a forged Will and document. 9. On 04.04.2025 I requested my representatives to check the status of the property and as an additional measure put a poster stating our ownership and possession and check if all is fine as far as the security of the property is concerned. My aunt who is the caretaker resides in village Punnumazra, SBS Nagar. On 05.04.2025 the

representatives visited the property and put a sign board that this property belongs to Mehnga Ram Sund and trespassers will be prosecuted. The property has been under my continuous possession. Photographs are attached with this email. 10. On our routine checking the very next day, we found our locks broken into and four to five men inside the property and my poster taken off and entered into the property illegally. It is shocking that in broad daylight such illegal acts are still happening on NRI properties. I request you to launch a full-fledged investigation and bring the guilty of such acts to law with strict actions taken against them and my peaceful possession returned. I am available for a call and also if you feel deem fit, I can travel and appear in person to substantiate my further.”

3. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners contend that as per the allegations levelled in the FIR, the Will dated 09.09.2008 and registered on 10.09.2008 was in favour of Rohit Kumar.

4. Counsel for the petitioner-Daljit Singh @ Kala contends that he has no concern or co-relation with the execution of the said document as he is neither a signatory nor a beneficiary of the transaction. He further contends that the petitioner is also not named in the said FIR, hence, the petitioner deserves the concession of pre-arrest bail. It is argued that interim concession was granted in favour of the petitioner on 24.12.2025, pursuant thereto he joined investigation. He further contends that the investigation in the case is complete and a final report already stands filed on 19.11.2025 against the other co-accused. Since no recovery is to be effected from the petitioner, hence, the filing of the chargesheet is not dependent upon the custodial interrogation of the petitioner. It is further argued that the

petitioner is not involved in any other criminal case. He submits that even though three other cases were registered against the petitioner, however, he already stands acquitted in two and the other remaining case has been quashed.

5. Counsel for the petitioner-Sahil Sharma, contends that the petitioner is a mere typist and that the Will in question had been got prepared by one Advocate Naresh Kumar. The petitioner is neither a signatory of the Will nor has he availed any benefit in the entire transaction. Hence, his further custodial detention is not justified. He further contends that it is a magisterial trial wherein the petitioner has already undergone an actual custody of nearly 04 months. There are no other cases against the said petitioner.

6. Counsel for the petitioner-Sethi further reiterates similar arguments and contends that the petitioner is in custody since 06.10.2025 and has undergone a custody of nearly 04 months in the present case. He further contends that as a matter of fact, after the Will had been executed in favour of Rohit Kumar, he also filed a Civil Suit for injunction wherein an order of status quo was granted in his favour on 08.04.2025. The present FIR has been registered later in point of time only to pressurize the petitioner-Sethi Lal herein. He contends that the petitioner was involved in one more similar case but he has been acquitted in the same.

7. Status report by way of an affidavit of Vikram, HPS, ACP, Panchkula dated 07.02.2026 in CRM-M-510-2026 and dated 11.02.2026 in CRM-M-72861-2025 and CRM-M-71464-2025 already stands filed and the same are taken on record.

8. Learned State Counsel on instructions from ASI Nirmal Singh,

Belt No. 02/Panchkula, Police Station Sector-5, Panchkula, contends that undisputedly the property in question was owned by Mehnga Ram-father of the complainant herein. They were residents of Chandigarh and the property in question is situated in Panchkula. Rohit Kumar i.e the beneficiary in the said Will carries on the business of property dealing in partnership with Daljit Singh @ Kala (petitioner in CRM-M-72861-2025). With a view to grab the said property by preparation of forged documents, they got in contact with Sethi Lal (petitioner in CRM-M-510-2026) who apprised them of his acquaintance Sahil Sharma (petitioner in CRM-M-71464-2025) and they assured that a forged document shall be got prepared. In collusion thereto, the Will dated 09.09.2008 was got registered in the office of Sub Registrar, Ludhiana (West) on 10.09.2008 allegedly against Vasika No. 1798.

9. Learned Counsel contends that the said fact has been verified and that the Will in question was never registered in the Office of Sub Registrar, Ludhiana (West) under the signatures of the Sub Registrar. It is further contended that although Vasika No. 1798 has been mentioned in the said registered Will, but at the relevant time Entries No. 423/424/425 were being recorded in the office of the Sub Registrar, Ludhiana (West). It is further contended that the signatures affixed as a witness are of one Sadhu Ram. As a matter of fact, Sadhu Ram Lambardar, resident of Village Talwara, District Ludhiana, had died on 28.04.2011. It is further contended that there was no occasion for Mehnga Ram to go to Ludhiana to register a Will in favour of Rohit Kumar when undisputedly both Mehnga Ram and Rohit Kumar were residing in Chandigarh and the property was situated in Panchkula. Further, there was also no circumstance for Sadhu Ram to

identify or know the executants of the documents since they were not ordinarily residents or had any traces in Ludhiana. Learned State Counsel contends that the signatures of the Sub Registrar, on the said document were forged and that during the course of investigation, Sahil Sharma i.e. the typist (petitioner in CRM-M-71464-2025) has acknowledged that the said signatures had been forged by him including the signatures of the Sub Registrar.

10. Learned State Counsel further contends that the accused Rohit Kumar mischievously filed a civil suit for injunction instead of seeking any declaration of his ownership on the strength of the said Will. She further contends that the petitioner-Daljit Singh @ Kala i.e. partner of Rohit is involved in other cases of similar nature registered at different Police Stations i.e. Police Station Mataur, Sona Mandi as well as Fatehgarh Sahib. She contends that notwithstanding the final outcome, it reflects the antecedents of the petitioner and his repeated brushes with crimes of similar nature.

11. She further contends that even co-accused -Sethi Lal was also involved in a similar offence. It is contended that the circumstances reflect a well organized operation adopted by the petitioners herein, who, in connivance with the officials, prepared forged documents so as to grab unattended properties of elderly people where the LR's are residing abroad. Institution of Civil Suit by itself, as a mode of defence against criminal action, should not provide an immunity to the accused/petitioners against custodial interrogation and detention.

12. I have heard learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners and have gone through the documents appended alongwith the

present petitions.

13. It is evident from a perusal of the aforesaid chronology and sequence of events recorded above and as disclosed by the respondent-State that the petitioner-Daljit Singh @ Kala, who claims himself to be not involved in the entire transaction is allegedly a partner with Rohit Kumar, in whose favour the forged Will was allegedly got registered on 10.09.2008. *Prima Facie*, it is also apparent that the said Will was never presented before the Sub Registrar and all the signatures and stamps of the Sub Registrar, on the documents are forged. Moreover, none of the Counsel for the petitioner (s) have been able to offer any explanation pertaining to the circumstances in which Mehnga Ram would have executed a Will in favour of Rohit Kumar or as to the special circumstances in which Mehnga Ram would go to Ludhiana to get the Will registered when both the parties i.e. the testator and beneficiary are residents of Chandigarh and the property is in Panchkula. There was thus generally no reason to travel 100 Kms to get the Will registered, when the same could also have been got registered here.

14. Further, the co-accused Rohit Kumar orchestrated a defence for himself by instituting a civil suit for injunction instead of seeking declaration by setting up the Will in his favour. The *prima facie* record collected by the Investigating Agency also shows that the entire edifice of the case set by the petitioner(s) herein is on forged documents, in an unholy attempt to usurp the property of elderly persons, who have children residing abroad or unattended properties. Being a well orchestrated crime, in a structured manner establishing, participation of each individual through separate transactions, the petitioners cannot plead that they were unaware or were not in collusion with each other in fabrication of such documents.

15. Crime pertaining to forgery of documents by mischievous property dealers in collusion with the deed writers, is neither new nor unknown and is on a rampant rise. The true owner thereafter continues battling before the Courts and ultimately succumbs to the greedy land shark’s and harassment caused to him as a result thereby. Such offences need to be curbed and to be sternly dealt with. Consequently, all the above three petitions are dismissed.

FEBRUARY 23, 2026
Vishal Sharma

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No