



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

205

CRM-M-42898-2024 (O&M)  
Date of decision: August 18<sup>th</sup>, 2025

Gurjeet Singh and another

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL**

Present: Mr. Parunjeet Singh, Advocate  
for the petitioners.

Mr. H.S. Deol, Senior Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

Mr. G.S. Jagpal, Advocate  
for the complainant.

**MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)**

Petitioners are seeking the concession of anticipatory bail in FIR No.46 dated 09.02.2023 under Sections 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of the IPC registered at Police Station Sohana, District SAS Nagar.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present FIR annexed as Annexure P-1. It is urged that the petitioners have been in occupation of the subject property since 01.05.2019 as *bona fide* tenants, and have been regularly paying rent in terms of the rent agreement, a copy of which has been annexed as Annexure P2.

3. It is further submitted that the petitioners have never, at any point in time, asserted any ownership rights over the said property. Learned counsel has also emphasized that the petitioners have no

connection whatsoever with the alleged transfer deed. Learned counsel has still further pointed out that the petitioners are neither signatories to the said deed nor does the document contain their photographs. The impugned transfer deed annexed as Annexure P4 has accordingly no nexus with the petitioners.

4. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the State assisted by counsel for the complainant has reiterated the allegations levelled in the FIR by submitting that the petitioners themselves fabricated and executed a forged transfer deed in favour of petitioner No.2. The said deed was purportedly executed by one Balbir Singh, who, in reality, was not the lawful owner of the property in question. It is further alleged that petitioner No.2, on the basis of the said forged deed, applied for an electricity connection with the PSPCL, which was later disconnected upon verification, when it transpired that the documents furnished were forged and fabricated. However, learned State counsel, on instructions has not disputed that the petitioners have complied with the order dated 08.01.2025 vide which the petitioners had been directed to join investigation by a coordinate Bench of this Court by noticing the following submissions:

*“Admittedly, in the instant case, possession of the disputed flat is to be handed over by the petitioners to the complainant only when the complainant will get record his statement in favour of the petitioners acknowledging compromise which is effected between the parties and relating to which, separate compromise quashing petition bearing CRM-M-63158-2024 is already filed.”*

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material on record.

6. Admittedly, the allegations in the present case rest primarily upon documentary evidence. The petitioners have complied with the order dated 08.01.2025 and joined investigation and, therefore, even as per instructions received by the learned State counsel his custodial interrogation is not required.

7. Having regard to the totality of the facts and circumstances, this Court deems it fit to extend the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

8. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed and interim order dated 08.01.2025, is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C./482 BNSS.

9. In the light of the decision of the petition, pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

**August 18<sup>th</sup>, 2025**  
*Puneet*

**(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)**  
**JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : No