



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

223

**CRM-M-27096-2025
Decided on : 08.10.2025**

Jaspal Singh . . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Ms. Pooja Dhingra, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Manjinder S. Bhullar, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed here-under:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Jaspal Singh	144	29.10.2024	406, 465, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of IPC, 1860	Kotwali	Bathinda

2. Allegation against the petitioner is that in the year 2010, complainant – Kulwant Singh's friend Shamsher Singh was employed in the company, i.e., Kim Infrastructure and Developers Limited (KIDL). MD of the company, i.e., accused Ravinder Singh Sidhu allured the complainant and Shamsher Singh for making investments in different policies, launched by the company KIDL, as in return they will receive double/triple amount in profit, on the invested amount. Complainant and his other relatives and friends purchased different policies and paid the huge amount in Crores of



Rupees. On maturity of the policies/FDRs, nothing was returned by the KIDL to the complainant or to the other investors, and thus, complainant came to know that the money invested by them has already been misappropriated and used by the accused for purchasing properties for their own personal gains.

3. Accused – Ravinder Singh Sidhu was lodged in jail in the year 2018 due to the registration of case against him and company office was also closed. In the year 2020, petitioner – Jaspal Singh (uncle of accused Ravinder Singh Sidhu), as Director of the company and other co-accused, Deepak Mittal, Gurvinder Singh Shanty and Kamaljeet Singh Bal, met the complainant Shamsher Singh and took back the original FDRs from them, vide which, they had invested their money. The FDRs were taken on the pretext that same would be invested in real estate. In fact, in lieu of the FDRs, fake possession letters on the Company head dated 12.01.2018 were issued in favour of Shamsher Singh for the land measuring 3K-11M.

4. Thereafter, petitioner and his accomplices again met the complainant and Shamsher Singh and took back the possession letters on the false pretext that possession of the property would be delivered through a court order by filing a case. However, till date, neither the possession of the plot has been given nor the invested amount returned, contrary to the undertaking given by the accused persons.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits as under:-

- (i) That there are total 9 accused, i.e., (i) Jaspal Singh Gill, (ii) Deepak Mittal, (iii) Director Kamaljeet Singh Bal, (iv) Gurvinder Singh Satti, (v) Harpreet Kaur, (vi) Ravinder Singh



Sidhu, (vii) Vinod Kumar, (viii) Director Krishan Kumar, and (ix) Palwinder Singh.

- (ii) That the alleged forgery pertains to an amount of Rs.3,38,43,169/-.
- (iii) That even complainant – Kulwant Singh has given an affidavit that the allegations against the petitioner were due to some misunderstanding, and he wants to withdraw the same.
- (iv) That petitioner – Jaspal Singh is aged about 58 years.
- (v) That all the offences are triable by the Court of Ld. Magistrate.

6. Learned counsel further argues that the petitioner has been in custody since 19.12.2024, and after completion of investigation, the challan has already been submitted. It is further submitted that several other FIRs arising out of the same set of transactions are pending, and all are to be decided together in view of the Hon'ble Apex Court's order passed in SLP (Crl.) No. 394 of 2024. As the trial is not likely to conclude in the near future, learned counsel prays for the grant of concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

7. On the other hand, learned State counsel while referring to the status report dated 24.07.2205, submits that in fact the FDRs, once which had been given to the complainant, were recollected from him to help out the main accused, i.e., Ravinder Singh Sidhu, on the pretext of delivering the possession of land measuring 3K-11M.

However, learned State counsel fairly concedes that, apart from the aforesaid act, there is no other specific allegation against the petitioner, Jaspal Singh, of having received any money from the complainant or of



directly inducing investment.

8. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and on perusal of the record, because of the following reasons, bail plea of the petitioner seems worth consideration:-

- (i) All the offences are triable by the Court of Learned Magistrate;
- (ii) Petitioner is inside jail for a period of about 07 months and 5 days.
- (iii) Investigation is complete and the challan has already been presented; however, charges are yet to be framed and the trial has not even commenced.
- (iv) Since all the offences are triable by the Court of learned Magistrate, ordinarily, even if the petitioner is convicted, the sentence is not likely to exceed three years, unless there are special circumstances justifying a higher sentence.
- (v) The allegations are yet to be proved by the prosecution against the petitioner beyond the shadow of reasonable doubt.
- (vi) Further incarceration of the petitioner for an indefinite period is not warranted at this stage, as conclusion of the trial is likely to take considerable time, and the liberty of the petitioner cannot be curtailed for such a prolonged duration.

9. Accordingly, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

10. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

11. Any of the discussion done and recorded here above, shall not



be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible, in accordance with law.

12. Petition stands **disposed of**.

Misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

October 08, 2025

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/~~No~~

Whether Reportable: Yes/~~No~~