

PBFD010031892026



Presented on : 15-05-2026
Registered on : 16-05-2026
Decided on : 27-05-2026
Duration : 0 years, 0 months, 12 days

Jaspreet Singh vs. State of Punjab**BA/1237/2026****Bail application u/s 482 of BNSS, 2023**

Present: Shri Abhishek Kanojia, Advocate, counsel for the applicant/
accused.
Ms. Shaminder Jeet Kaur, Ld.APP for the State.

ORDER

1. Heard on the bail application filed on behalf of applicant/accused under Section 482 of BNSS for anticipatory bail, **in case//FIR no.114 dated 01.04.2024 (25.07.2024), under Section 436, 450, 34 IPC, PS Sadar Kotkapura**, whereby it is submitted that false case has been registered against the accused/applicant due to earlier grudge of FIR no.81/2024, PS Sadar Kotkapura. The applicant/accused did not commit any offence as alleged in the FIR, rather he is quite innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. No offence is made out against the applicant/accused. nothing is to be recovered from the applicant/accused. The accused/applicant is ready to join the investigation. Accordingly, prayer is made for allowing the present application.

2. Upon notice, learned Additional PP put in appearance on behalf of State and although reply to the application is not intended to be filed by the State, but the said petition is hotly contested by the learned Additional PP for the State and accordingly, request is made for dismissal of the present bail application

3. Brief facts of the case as emanating from the record are that the instant FIR was registered on the complaint/ statement of complainant Gurdas Singh, whereby he stated that he is doing agricultural work after his retirement as a civil staff in the department of police, but has moved to Faridkot City for the sake of his children's education. His ancestral house

and land are in village Kot Sukhian. He has purchased 19 kanals 11 marla land from Gurdit Singh, Baltej Kaur alias Bholi, Naseeb Kaur, Darshan Singh and his sister Shindo through various sale deeds. On 12.07.1994, Gurdit Singh brother of Darshan Singh, sold land measuring 04 kanals 07 marla in Khasra No.1081. Darshan Singh's sister Baltej Kaur alias Bholi also sold 4 kanals 7 marlas land in Khasra No.1080. On 14.08.1998, Darshan Singh had sold 1 kanal 9 marlas land in Khasra No.1081 and 18 marlas in Khasra No.1080. Thereafter, Darshan Singh sold remaining 02 kanals of land of his share vide sale deed dated 04.01.2000, wherein he has shown the details of the directions of all sides of his land in Khasra No.1080, including the Khal Kaisi on the East side. But by deception, Darshan Singh got the land of Khasra No.1081 written again as Khasra No.1081, which was previously sold in the year 1998, when he had registered sale deed of land measuring 18 marla land of khasra no. 1080 and completed 2 kanals 7 marlas of land. Thereafter, on 26.07.2002, Shindo sold the area land measuring 04 kanals in Khasra No.1080. On 26.07.2002, Naseeb Kaur daughter of Bachan Singh sold 2 kanals 10 marlas in Khasra No.1080. When he came to know that 2 kanal land was sold as per possession, of which Khasra number has been written wrongly, he had filed a case regarding the correction of Khasra number in the Court, which was decided on 08.04.2024 by the Court Ms. Chandan JMIC, Faridkot, but Darshan Singh while claiming that the case has been decided in his favor, wanted to illegally occupy his land and on 24.05.2024, he with the help of his family members, relatives and unknown persons tried to illegally occupy his land comprised in Khasra no.1081, while he has already purchased the land comprised in Khasra number 1081 from his brother Gurdit Singh, but the dispute is about the land Khasra number 1080. As per sale deeds, he is the owner in possession of 19 kanal 11 marla land. According to the records of the Revenue Department, no land of Darshan Singh or others remains in these Khasra numbers, but Darshan Singh had fraudulently sold the land measuring 2 kanal to him, but its transfer could not be registered in his name. Despite the pending case in the Court, he wanted to get possession of the land

previously sold 25 years ago, illegally, due to which on 24.05.2024, he had a fight with his wife Karamjit Kaur and his relative Naib Singh son of Munsu Singh, who have been beaten up badly by them, who remained hospitalized and a case was registered regarding the same. Apart from this, during the year 2002, complainant had sold a house built on 10 marla land to Darshan Singh, regarding which Darshan Singh had signed a contract with him on 08.08.2017 by receiving promissory notes and cash amounting to a total of Rs.3,47,500/-, but he did not get the sale deed registered on the date stipulated date i.e., 15.07.2018, due to which he had filed a case in the Court, on which the Court had asked Darshan Singh to return the amount along with interest at the rate of 6%, but he did not return the amount to him, due to which he had filed a case before the Hon'ble High Court, which is pending. He had left his relative Naib Singh son of Munsu Singh, resident of village Mallan, district Faridkot, at his house to take care of his land, livestock and house, who takes care of his livestock, land and house, for which they provide food, water and tea etc. On 24.05.2024, his wife Karamjit Kaur had gone to their farm with the food and water for his relative Naib Singh, where Darshan Singh and others tried to illegally occupy it. Darshan Singh etc. have been committing nefarious acts for a long time with the intention to illegally occupy his land by force. On 01.04.2024, Darshan Singh, his wife Davinder Kaur, sons Komaljit Singh and Jaspreet Singh set on fire the cattle shed built in their farm in which their valuables were stored with the intention of occupying and intimidating them. Accordingly, prayer was made for taking appropriate legal action against the accused person.

4. It is argued by learned APP for the State that the accused has committed heinous crime and as such, they are not entitled for the concession of anticipatory bail.

5. The said contentions of learned APP for the State are controverted by learned defence counsel. It is submitted by him that accused is innocent and that he has been falsely implicated in the present case. No injury is attributed to the present applicant/accused. Accordingly request is made for allowing the present application.

6. After hearing and considering the rival contentions of learned Additional PP for the State and learned defence counsel and after going through the record carefully, this Court is convinced with the submissions of learned Additional PP for the State.

7. Keeping in view the gravity of offence and nature of allegations levelled against the accused/ applicants, this Court is of the opinion that custodial interrogation of the applicant/accused is necessary for proper and effective investigation of the case to arrive at the truth. Accordingly, this court is of the considered opinion that the accused/ applicant is not entitled to the relief of anticipatory bail in the present case and **as such, the bail application in hand is hereby dismissed.**

8. However, it is made clear that any observation made by this court while disposing of the aforesaid bail application shall not be construed as any expression of opinion on the merits of the main case. Police record be returned to the quarter concerned. Bail application file be consigned to the record Room.

Pronounced in the open court:

Date of order: 27.05.2026

Sneh lata

**(Krishan Kant Jain)
AD&SJ/JSC/MACT,
Faridkot/UID No.PB0163**