

CRM-M-11408-2025

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

CRM-M-11408-2025  
Reserved on: 03.04.2025  
Pronounced on: 08.04.2025

Jagdish Singh alias D.C.

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Sukhmeet Singh, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Akshay Kumar, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Akashdeep Singh, Advocate  
for the complainant.

\*\*\*\*

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
60	28.03.2024	City Kotakpura	419, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 506, 120B IPC (Section 111 of BNS added later on)

1. The petitioner incarcerated in the FIR captioned above had come up before this Court under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, [BNSS], seeking regular bail.

2. As per custody certificate dated 02.04.2025, the accused has the following criminal antecedents:

Sr. No.	FIR No.	Date	Offenses	Police Station
1	111	27.08.2012	406/420/120B IPC	Baghapurana
2	23	25.05.2019	420 IPC	Smaalsar
3	34	12.06.2018	420/120B IPC	Smaalsar
4	93	07.09.2020	418/420/120B IPC	Smaalsar

3. The facts and allegations are being taken from the reply filed by the State, which reads as follows:

*“...the complainant, Bhura Singh submitted an application to the Senior Superintendent of Police, Faridkot, seeking registration of FIR against 1) Darshan Singh s/o Puran Singh, 2) Jagdish Singh @ DC (present petitioner) s/o Ajaib Singh, 3) Jasvir Kaur w/o Jaswant Singh, 4) Inderjit*

CRM-M-11408-2025

*Singh (Bank Account Holder), 5) Harbans Singh, Stamp Vendor, 6) Rakesh Kumar, Notary, 7) Anju Rani Sharma, 8) Jagdeep Singh (Impersonator) and other unknown persons.*

*5. That on receipt of said application, the enquiry was entrusted to the deponent by the SSP, Faridkot and the deponent, during enquiry, collected sufficient material viz. Bank statements evidencing fund transfers from complainant Bhura Singh to various accused persons, Cheques and RTGS receipts totaling approx. Rs. 72,50,000/-, Fake agreement to sell land measuring 93 kanal 10 marla situated in Kotkapura, Aadhar cards and other identification documents which were found to be forged. Besides the aforesaid documents, the statements of the complainant and independent witnesses including commission agent Ramesh Kumar and Amarjit Singh were also recorded.*

*6. That during enquiry it has been found that the \* complainant Bhura Singh was looking for some land to buy, therefore he contacted accused Darshan Singh s/o Puran Singh and Jagdish Singh @ D.C (present petitioner) who were working as property dealers and they had shown the complainant a piece of land measuring 93 kanals 10 marla situated at Dwareana Raod, Kotkapura. Both the accused Darshan Singh and Jagdish Singh got the complainant introduced with a person who impersonating himself to be Jagdeep Singh, and recorded to be co-sharer in said land. The deal was struck at the rate of Rs.23,70,000/- per acre. Apart of Jagdeep Singh, his brother Kuldeep Singh and nephew Harjot Singh were also shareholder in land. On 19.05.2023, said Jagdeep Singh executed an agreement to sell in favour of complainant for whole piece of land including on behalf of other two co-sharers Kuldeep Singh and Harjot Singh and obtained earnest money of Rs.40,00,000/-. Thereafter, accused also received Rs.32,50,000/- from complainant as earnest money And the date for registration of sale deed was fixed for 30.12.2023 which was extended by co-accused Anju Rani Sharma on behalf of Jagdeep Singh for 15.01.2024. However, from the conduct of accused, the complainant got suspicious and he made enquiry and contacted the original owners of the land who denied about any proposal of selling their land and stated that they had neither received any earnest money from the complainant nor executed any agreement to sell.*

*7. That during enquiry that the real Jagdeep Singh Sran S/o Sukhmander Singh R/o Muzaffar Nagar, Uttar Pradesh was joined in the inquiry who categorically stated that he or his brother nor their nephew ever entered*

CRM-M-11408-2025

*into any agreement to sell of their land. Even the complainant also admitted that he had paid the entire amount to some other person who was not Jagdeep Singh in real. This fact constituted the offence of cheating and impersonating.*

*8. That during enquiry it has been found that the real Jagdeep Singh has his UID No.890606506397 in which his date of birth is shown as 02.12.1983 but the fake UID produced by duplicate Jagdeep Singh was bearing No. 134394250574 and date of birth was recorded as 10.07.1977 which fully established that the accused in order to commit fraud with the complainant had prepared forged and fabricated Adhaar card of Jagdeep Singh and committed forgery.*

*9. That during enquiry, it has also been found that the accused 1) Darshan Singh 2) Jagdish Singh alias D.C (present petitioner), 3) Inderjeet Singh, 4) Jasvir Kaur and 5) Anju Rani Sharma, 6) Jagdeep Singh alongwith two other unknown persons were hand in glove to commit fraud with complainant Bhura Singh and had deceived him for amount of Rs. 72,50,000/- and also extended threats to him.*

*10. That after conducting fair and impartial enquiry, the deponent vide his fact-finding report no. 725-PC-R-DSP-KKP dated 23.03.2024 recommended to register FIR against petitioner and co-accused for offence U/S 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 506,120-B IPC and forwarded the report to the Senior Superintendent of Police, Faridkot for necessary action.”*

4. The petitioner's counsel prays for bail by imposing any stringent conditions and contends that further pre-trial incarceration would cause an irreversible injustice to the petitioner and their family.

5. The State's counsel opposes bail and refers to the reply.

6. It would be appropriate to refer to the following portions of the reply, which read as follows:

*“Role of the petitioner:*

*i) Petitioner alongwith co-accused Darshan Singh was instrumental in introducing the complainant with fictitious seller of the property.*

*ii) On his inducement, the complainant entered into an agreement to sell with the fake sellers and transferred an amount of Rs. 72,50,000/-as sale consideration of the property.*

CRM-M-11408-2025

- iii) *Petitioner alone had received Rs.57,50,000/-from the complainant.*  
 iv) *Petitioner has arranged the impersonator Jagdeep Singh.”*

REASONING:

7. Allegations against the petitioner are that he along with co-accused Darshan Singh had cheated the complainant for an amount of Rs72,50,000/-. There is sufficient prima facie evidence connecting the petitioner with the alleged crime. However, pre-trial incarceration should not be a replica of post-conviction sentencing. Per paragraph 5 of the bail petition, the petitioner has been in custody since 24.10.2024. Per the custody certificate dated 02.04.2025, the petitioner's total custody in this FIR is 05 months & 05 days. Given the penal provisions invoked viz-a-viz pre-trial custody, coupled with the prima facie analysis of the nature of allegations, and the other factors peculiar to this case, there would be no justifiability for further pre-trial incarceration at this stage.

8. Without commenting on the case's merits, in the facts and circumstances peculiar to this case, and for the reasons mentioned above, the petitioner makes a case for bail. This order shall come into force from the time it is uploaded on this Court's official webpage.

9. Given above, provided the petitioner is not required in any other case, the petitioner shall be released on bail in the FIR captioned above subject to furnishing bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned Court and due to unavailability before any nearest Ilaqa Magistrate/duty Magistrate. Before accepting the surety, the concerned Court must be satisfied that if the accused fails to appear, such surety can produce the accused.

10. While furnishing a personal bond, the petitioner shall mention the following personal identification details:

1.	AADHAR number	
2.	Passport number (If available) and when the attesting officer/court considers it appropriate or considers the accused a flight risk.	
3.	Mobile number (If available)	
4.	E-Mail id (If available)	

11. The petitioner shall abide by all statutory bond conditions and appear before the concerned Court(s) on all dates. The petitioner shall not tamper with the evidence, influence, browbeat, pressurize, induce, threaten, or promise, directly or indirectly, any witnesses, Police officials, or any other person acquainted with the facts and circumstances of the case or dissuade them from disclosing such facts to the Police or the Court.

**12. This bail is conditional, and the foundational condition is that if the petitioner indulges in any similar offence or the offence in which sentence is more than three years, the State/complainant may file an application for cancellation of this bail before**

CRM-M-11408-2025

**the Sessions Court, which shall be at liberty to cancel this bail.**

13. Any observation made hereinabove is neither an expression of opinion on the case's merits nor shall the trial Court advert to these comments.

14. A certified copy of this order would not be needed for furnishing bonds, and any Advocate for the Petitioner can download this order along with case status from the official web page of this Court and attest it to be a true copy. If the attesting officer wants to verify its authenticity, such an officer can also verify its authenticity and may download and use the downloaded copy for attesting bonds.

15. **Petition allowed** in terms mentioned above. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)  
JUDGE

08.04.2025  
anju rani

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes  
Whether reportable: No.