



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

142

**CRM-M No.23833 of 2025 (O&M)**

**Date of decision: 02.05.2025**

Amit Gaur

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR**

**Present:** Mr. Akshay Chadha, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Subhash Godara, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

**HARPREET SINGH BRAR J. (Oral)**

1. Prayer in this 1<sup>st</sup> petition filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.04 dated 27.02.2025 registered under Sections 318(4), 319(2), 336(2), 336(3), 338, 340(2), 61(2) of BNS, 2023 (wrongly mentioned as BNSS, 2023 in the headnote and prayer clause of the petition), at Police Station EO Branch, Punjab Vigilance Bureau Ludhiana, District Ludhiana.

2. The brief facts of the case are that on 21.02.2025, during a surprise inspection by the Vigilance Bureau at the office of Sub-Registrar, Ludhiana (West), a case of impersonation and fraudulent property registration came to light. The investigation revealed that a sale deed *qua* Vasika No.2024-25/101/1/20859 dated 11.02.2025, had been executed for the sale of land measuring 14 kanals situated at Village Nurpur Bet-2, District Ludhiana, in favour of Deepak Goel, for a total

2025:PHHC:057422



sale consideration of Rs.30,20,000/-, however, it was found that the person who appeared as the seller namely Deep Singh, was an impersonator, who falsely posed himself as the actual owner of the land, in question. The sale deed was registered by Sub-Registrar Jagsir Singh and the Registry Clerk Krishan Gopal processed the said transaction. The identity of the impersonator was allegedly verified and attested by Nambardar Baghel Singh besides Gurcharan Singh Marwaha and Raghuvir Singh. The actual signatures and photographs of other individuals were also fraudulently substituted in the sale deed. Amit Gaur (petitioner herein), acting as the representative of purchaser Deepak Goel, appeared at the Sub-Registrar's office on the date of registration and later on collected the registered documents and despite clear irregularities in the presence of witnesses and the identity of the seller, he allegedly raised no objection. Based on the documentary evidence, official endorsements and expert opinion, the FIR (supra) has been registered, against all the accused persons allegedly involved in the aforesaid fraudulent act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that the petitioner merely acted as an agent of the purchaser, Deepak Goel, and his involvement in the registration process was limited to routine tasks, such as ensuring the signing and photograph of the purchaser. The petitioner was unaware that the seller, Deep Singh, was being impersonated. The petitioner is not a direct beneficiary of the transaction and he is not engaged in any fraudulent activities. The



petitioner's role was purely administrative, and he was only acting on behalf of the purchaser. The petitioner is not named in the FIR as the main conspirator in the alleged fraud. No recovery is to be effected from the petitioner and the entire case of the prosecution is based upon documentary evidence, which is already in the custody of the jurisdictional police authorities. Moreover, the co-accused of the petitioner namely Raghuvir Singh, who also played a role in the execution of sale deed, has already been granted the concession of *ad interim* anticipatory bail by this Court.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel opposes the prayer of the petitioner for bail on the ground that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature as he himself appeared on behalf of the purchaser Deepak Goel before the Sub-Registrar, wherein the seller Deep Singh was impersonated and the property worth crores of rupees was got purchased without making any payment. The petitioner's role in the process of registration of the sale deed, raises serious suspicion about his complicity in the alleged crime.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record with their able assistance.

6. Upon careful consideration of the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court finds that the petitioner, Amit Gaur, was actively involved in the process of registering the sale deed, in question. The active participation of the petitioner in the registration process amidst fraudulent circumstances, including the presence of an impersonator



posing as a seller, cannot be ignored. The petitioner's presence in the office of Sub-Registrar and the fact that he collected the registered sale deed further establishes his involvement in the commission of offence. Notably, the property in question, which is allegedly valued at over Rs.7.00 crores, was sold for a grossly undervalued amount of Rs.30,20,000/- in lieu of cheques, which were never encashed, indicating that the transaction was a sham, which was executed without proper verification of the witnesses at the time of registration of sale deed, further highlighting the suspicious nature of the transaction. Clearly, not even a single penny had gone from the pocket of purchaser either to the impersonator or original owner.

7. Apart from this, it is significant to note that as per the appointment details taken by the purchaser for execution and registration of the sale deed, one Advocate Sham Sunder was originally designated to identify the parties, however, Advocate Sham Sunder did not appear before the Sub-Registrar, Ludhiana (West) on 11.02.2025 for reasons which may reasonably suggest that he had apprehended the fraudulent nature of the transaction and refrained himself from associating in the alleged offence.

8. The gravity of the allegations, coupled with the fraudulent undervaluation and impersonation, call for a deeper probe into the matter. Nevertheless, the investigation is going on and the petitioner's presence during the course of investigation is required for a thorough



inquiry into the circumstances surrounding the fraudulent registration of the sale deed.

9. In light of the above and considering the gravity of the allegations, this Court is not inclined to grant the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, at this stage.

10. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.

**(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)**  
**JUDGE**

**02.05.2025**

*yakub*

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No