



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

104

CRM-M-57501-2025(O&M)

Date of decision: 14.10.2025

Inderjeet Singh

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

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

Present :- Mr. Lovish Arora, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Section 483(3) read with Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for cancellation of the anticipatory bail granted to respondents No.2 to 9 vide order dated 15.09.2025 passed by the Additional Sessions Judge, Rupnagar in case bearing FIR No.133 dated 08.08.2025 registered under Sections 420, 465, 467 and 120B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Sadar Rupnagar, District Rupnagar.

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that Gurmukh Singh (father of the petitioner) alongwith his brothers were owners of the property situated in Village Bheora and Village Lakhimpur. On 16.08.2011, a settlement was arrived at between the petitioner's father and his brothers regarding the partition of the ancestral property. The said settlement was reduced in writing in presence of the witnesses and was implemented. As per the same, an area measuring 3000 square yards fell into the share of Gurmukh Singh (father of the petitioner herein). He further



104 CRM-M-57501-2025(O&M)

submits that the petitioner's father died on 18.08.2016 whereupon the property in question stood transferred in favour of the petitioner, his brother Jasvir Singh and sister Gurbinder Kaur. The aforesaid land was eventually acquired by National Highways Authority of India for the Project of road-building from Ludhiana to Rupnagar. They were however paid compensation only for an area measuring 2000 square yards. On an enquiry, it transpired that only an area measuring 2000 square yards is shown to have been registered in name of the petitioners. He submits that it then transpired that the uncles of the petitioner and his cousins in connivance with each other, showed another settlement of 2013, which purportedly bears the signature of petitioner's father supported by a forged affidavit. A separate agreement of partition dated 26.06.2013 was purportedly executed by forging the signatures of petitioner's father while reducing the area. It is contended that the report of the handwriting expert shows that the signatures have been forged. He submits that the aforesaid aspects have not been taken into consideration by the Trial Court while granting concession of anticipatory bail to the accused persons-private respondents herein.

3. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and have gone through the documents appended along with the present petition.

4. The order confirming interim bail granted to the respondents-accused on different dates have been upheld. After noticing that the case is based on documentary evidence and prima facie involves determination of the agreement of partition dated 26.06.2013, the Court extended the benefit of anticipatory bail to the respondents-accused. The parameters for cancellation of a bail granted by a Court are at variance with the parameters



104 CRM-M-57501-2025(O&M)

for rejection of a bail. There is no allegation as would reflect existence of circumstances as would mandate cancellation of bail granted to the respondents-accused. There is no allegation of any abuse of the bail or the likelihood of the respondents-accused tampering with the evidence. Besides the nature of offence cannot also be said to be shocking to the conscience of the society at large.

5. In the absence of any exigent circumstances, merely because a discretionary power vested in a Court has been exercised for objective reasons, the same would not be interfered with by the High Court.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner has not been able to point out any illegality, perversity or impropriety in the order confirming the bails granted to the respondents-accused on different dates.

7. In view of the above, the present petition is *dismissed*.

8. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

14.10.2025

Sumit Gusain

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

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE