



208

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-16912-2025
Date of decision:-28.05.2025

HIMMAT SINGH

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

... Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY.

Present:- Mr. Hitesh Chopra, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. K.D. Sachdeva, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Harvinder Singh Mann, Advocate for the complainant.

SANJIV BERRY, J. (ORAL)

The instant petition has been preferred by the petitioner under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail in the following case (Annexure P-1):-

FIR No.	Dated	Sections	Police Station
523	21.11.2024	406, 420 IPC	Zirakpur, District SAS Nagar

2. Arguments heard.

3. It is *inter alia* contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case he has no concern with the alleged transaction nor he is beneficiary thereof. He



submits that infact the petitioner himself is one of the victims, along with the complainant Vijay Kumar and Rao Varinder Singh, of the misdeeds of co-accused Charanjit Singh to whom he has paid a proportionate sale consideration, as such he prayed for grant of bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant referring to the reply submitted by the State have assailed these arguments by submitting that the petitioner infact had prepared the fake documents in connivance with the co-accused Charanjit Singh whereby Charanjit Singh was shown to be the owner of the property which he had already sold. They contend that the petitioner had handed over the revenue record in the form of Jamabandi of 2021-2022 to the complainant, pretending co-accused Charanjit Singh to be the owner in possession thereof and according to the complainant, they were allured to pay the sale consideration. They contend that these revenue records were duly signed by the petitioner in token of correctness, whereas as per actual revenue record, said Charanjit Singh had already sold the property. Learned State counsel submits that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required, hence prayed for dismissal of the bail petition.

5. After considering the rival contentions and perusing the record, it transpires that allegations against the petitioner happen to be that he had introduced the alleged seller Charanjit Singh-co-accused to the complainant party and had even shown the fabricated revenue record under his signatures, claiming co-accused Charanjit Singh to be the owner of the property and in this manner allured the complainant party to part with ₹2.5



crores to said Charanjit Singh. It has come on record that infact Charanjit Singh had already sold the property before entering into the transactions with the complainant party. The petitioner has acted in conspiracy with co-accused Charanjit Singh to deceive and dupe the complainant party, whereby they were allured to part with huge amount qua purchase of the property of which Charanjit Singh has already ceased to be owner thereof. Therefore, considering the serious nature and gravity of the offence, no case is made out in favour of the petitioner for grant of anticipatory bail, as a consequence, the petition is hereby dismissed.

6. Any observation made above shall not be construed as opinion of this Court on the merits of the case.

7. Pending application(s) if any shall also stand disposed of.

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

28.05.2025

Gyan

i)	Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
ii)	Whether reportable?	Yes/No