



2026:PHHC:063193

CRM-M-59933-2025 (O&M)

1

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

2026:PHHC:063193



CRM-M-59933-2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 23.04.2026

**SUKHPAL SINGH AND OTHERS ... PETITIONERS
VERSUS
STATE OF PUNJAB ... RESPONDENT**

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Jupinder Pal Singh Brar, Advocate for the petitioners.
(through video conferencing).

Mr. Parneet Singh Pandher, A.A.G., Punjab.

Mr. Jatinder Pal Singh, Advocate for the complainant.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

CRM-17494-2026

This is an application for addition of offence under Sections 318(4), 336(1), 336(2), 336(3), 338, 340(2) BNS (Corresponding Sections 420, 463, 465, 468, 471 IPC) in the head note and prayer clause of the petition which has been added later on.

Application is allowed.

Sections 318(4), 336(1), 336(2), 336(3), 338, 340(2) BNS (Corresponding Sections 420, 463, 465, 468, 471 IPC) are allowed to be incorporated in the head note and prayer clause of the petition.

Registry is directed to make necessary entry in the head note and prayer clause of the petition.

Main case

1. The petitioner is seeking anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (erstwhile Section 438 Cr.P.C.) in FIR No. 242 dated 22.09.2025 under Sections 331(4), 305, 329(3), and 238 of BNS



registered at Police Station Lambi, District Sri Muktsar Sahib.

2. The case of the prosecution is that FIR has been got registered on the statement of Malkeet Singh, who stated that in Village Mahuwana, there was a house belonging to Mahinder Singh, who had shifted to Bathinda about 10-15 years ago. As per complainant, he had purchased the abovementioned house in January, 2025 against the payment of Rs.11,55,000/-. According to complainant, the former owner of the property, namely Mahinder Singh, had constructed a boundary wall also, to separate his house from the house of his brother, namely Sukhpal Singh. It was further alleged by the complainant that he was in possession of abovementioned house, and in the abovementioned house, he had kept his trolley, blue cultivator, two sets of straw-making nets, and 20 quintals of wheat. According to complainant, by demolishing the intervening wall between the two houses, the abovementioned articles have been taken away by the petitioner, and the petitioner has also entered into illegal possession of the abovementioned property.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. As the land belonged to the Panchayat, therefore, no case of trespass could be registered against the petitioner.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel and counsel for the complainant have opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner on the ground of gravity of allegations and submitted that offences under Sections 318(4), 336(1), 336(2), 336(3), 338, 340(2) BNS have also been added in the present case. Learned State counsel further submitted that petitioner No.1 has used a stamp paper worth Rs.50/- which was purchased from stamp



vendor on 31.12.2015 and an agreement-to-sell dated 27.03.2004 was made by forging the signatures.

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

6. Keeping in view the entire facts and circumstances of the case, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for thorough and effective investigation of the case. Therefore, considering the seriousness and gravity of the allegations, no exceptional or extraordinary grounds are made out for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

23.04.2026

Janki

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No