

CIS No.BA/1566/2025

CNR No.PBHO01004661-2025

Pardeep Kumar @ Pardeep Kumar Sharma Vs. State of Punjab

FIR No.144 dated 06.06.2025

Under Section 329(3), 318(4), 61(2), 338, 336(3)
BNS, PS Tanda, District Hoshiarpur.

Present: Sh.Naveen Jairath, Adv. for the applicant-accused.
Sh.NS Gill, Addl. PP for the State

Learned counsel for the applicant/accused has submitted that the applicant/accused has joined the investigation on 24.06.2025 in compliance of order dated 18.06.2025.

ASI Parvinder Singh, No.1286/HPR, PS Tanda, has come present in this case and stated that he has brought the police record pertaining to the present case. Accused-applicant has joined investigation in the present case on dated 24.06.2025. He has further stated that he has obtained certified copy of Patanama from the office of Sub Registrar, Tanda. There is difference between the Patanama presented by accused Jagjiwan Jaggi and the certified copy obtained from the office of Sub Registrar, Tanda. He has further stated that the comparison of signatures of Tarlok Singh is also necessary for the investigation. The passport as well as Pan Card of Tarlok Singh are taken into police possession for the purpose of comparison of his signature. The applicant/accused is not cooperating in the investigation and giving vague answers to the queries put to him. So, the custodial interrogation of accused/applicant is very much necessary for the proper investigation.

This court is of the view that the certified copy has been obtained by the I.O. of Patanama and it is clear that the original Patanama was not prepared in the same process with its copy which is lying in the office of Sub Registrar Tanda and there are minor discrepancies like inserting arrow at note given and signature of Tilak Raj MC at two places etc. but that is quite possible when the original and copy is not prepared in same process and prepared separately which is generally being done by deed writers. The last line/note which is handwritten is also there in the certified copy and whether Tarlok Singh was competent to execute such document or not is a matter to be decided by civil court. So as discussed in detail while granting the interim bail vide order dated 18.06.2025 and without commenting upon the merits of the case, interim bail granted to him vide order dated 18.06.2025 is hereby made absolute subject to all conditions under Section 482 (2) of BNSS. Bail application is accordingly disposed off. Let the papers be consigned to the Judicial Record Room, Hoshiarpur.

Announced in open court:
Dated 05.07.2025
Rakesh Kumar, Steno

(Amit Kumar Garg)
Addl. Sessions Judge
Hoshiarpur
UID No. PB0260