IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-10902-2026
Date of Decision: 26.05.2026
Uploaded on: 26.05.2026

JOGINDER SHARMA

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent

CRM-M-13239-2026

BALDEV KAUR

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present: Mr. Vinod Ghai, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Arnav Ghai, Advocate
Mr. Sajal Bansal, Advocate
Ms. Kashish Sahni, Advocate
Mr. Jeevanjot Singh Kang, Advocate and
Ms. Jahnvi Juneja, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-10902-2026.

Mr. P.S. Ahluwalia, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Keerat Dhillon, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-13239-2026.

Mr. T.P. Singh, Sr. DAG, Haryana assisted by
Mr. Manjeet Singh, Dy. Director Prosecution and
Mr. Vijay Kumar Nehra, DSP, SV/ACB, Panchkula.

Mr. Himmat Singh Deol, Advocate
for aggrieved investors.

****

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J.

This order shall dispose of two petitions bearing CRM-M-10902-2026 titled as Joginder Sharma Vs. State of Haryana and CRM-M-13239-2026 titled as Baldev Kaur Vs. State of Haryana as both arise out of the same FIR.

2. The prayer in the present petitions under Section 482 BNSS, 2023 is for the grant of anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.03 dated 30.01.2026 registered under Section 61(2) of BNS, 2023, Section 7 of the Prevention of Corruption Act along with Sections 238, 316(5), 318, 336(3) and 340 of BNS, 2023 (subsequently added) at Police Station State Vigilance and Anti-Corruption Bureau, District Panchkula.

3. For the sake of convenience, the facts have been taken from the Reply dated 11.05.2026 by way of affidavit of Vijay Kumar Nehra, DSP, P.S. State Vigilance & Anti-Corruption Bureau, Panchkula in CRM-M-10902-2026.

4. The FIR in the present case came to be registered on the basis of an Intelligence Report dated 29.01.2026 whereby it was revealed that Vikram Singla posted as Tehsildar despite being aware about the restriction on sale pertaining to the land in question in the present case imposed vide a Rapat No.110 dated 25.10.2019 in connivance with Baldev Kaur and others got registered sale deed No.1109 dated 16.10.2025 whereby Baldev Kaur sold her land measuring 141 kanal 8 marlas 7 Sarsai comprised in Hadbast No.210 Village Shahpur, Tehsil Raipur Rani, Panchkula to Naveen S/o Devender S/o Sh. Banwari Lal, Resident of Village Badala, District Bhiwani in lieu of Rs.1

crore. After obtaining sanction U/s 17-A Prevention of Corruption Act qua Vikram Singla, the case FIR No.3 dated 30.01.2026 U/s 7 P.C. Act and Section 140(2) BNS has registered at Police Station ACB, Panchkula initially against Vikram Singla and Baldev Kaur (petitioner in CRM-M-13239-2026). During the course of the investigation, Joginder Sharma, L.A.O. (petitioner in CRM-M-10902-2026) came to be nominated as an accused.

5. The brief background of the case as emanating from the affidavit dated 11.05.2026 of Vijay Kumar Nehra, DSP, P.S. State Vigilance & Anti-Corruption Bureau, Panchkula is that Kulbir Singh and Lakhbir Singh sons of Malkiat Singh, Surmukh Singh S/o Ranjodh Singh along with others and M/s PGF Ltd. (Pearl Green Forest) purchased land measuring 700 kanals approx. in Village Shahpur Tehsil Raipur Rani from different persons vide four sale deeds i.e. sale deed Nos.133, 134 both dated 05.05.2004, sale deed No.419 dated 16.06.2004 and Sale deed No.452 dated 23.06.2004 (Annexures R-5 to R-8).

In the case titled as M/s PGF Ltd. & others Vs. Union of India & another, bearing Civil Appeal No.6572 of 2004, preferred by M/s PGF Ltd. & others against the judgment dated 26.07.2004 passed by this Court in CWP No.188 of 2003, the Hon’ble Supreme Court while dismissing the said appeal vide judgment dated 12.03.2013 directed the CBI and the Income Tax Department to investigate into the malpractices of M/s PGF Ltd. and to initiate appropriate civil and criminal proceedings against the said entity. In compliance with the judgment dated 12.03.2013, a preliminary inquiry was conducted by the CBI which revealed that M/s PGF Ltd. and M/s PACL Ltd.

(Pearls Agrotech Corporation Ltd.) had induced a large number of investors to invest by falsely allotting lands in their names despite not owning such land. Upon completion of the inquiry, it was recommended that a case be registered against M/s PGF Ltd. through its Managing Director Nirmal Singh Bhangoo (brother of Baldev Kaur), Directors Harchand Singh, Chander Bhushan Dhillon and Prem Seth whole time Directors Gurmeet Singh and Subrata Bhattacharya and Addl. Director Gurjant Singh Gill for offences under Sections 120B and 420 IPC. Consequently, the CBI registered a case bearing RC No.BDI/2014/F/ 2004 dated 19.02.2014, Police Station CBI/BS&FC, New Delhi.

Pursuant to the registration of the FIR, a search was conducted on 22.02.2014 in the office premises of M/s PGF Ltd. at Paschim Vihar, New Delhi. During the course of the said search, various property related documents were seized including the aforementioned sale deed Nos.133, 134, 419 and 452 which were taken into possession vide a different Malkhana (MR) Nos.1005/14, 1009/14, 1196/14 and 990/14 respectively.

Vide order dated 01.04.2015 passed in M/s PGF Ltd. Vs. Union of India, the Hon’ble Supreme Court constituted a Committee comprising of Justice K. Ramamoorthy and Justice R.V. Easwar for the purposes of realizing investor funds through sale of immovable properties and liquidation of the fixed deposits of M/s PGF Ltd. The Court directed the CBI to handover all seized documents to the Committee. Later, Justice K. Ramamoorthy was substituted by Vikramjit Sen (retired judge of the Hon’ble Supreme Court). Pertinently, the four sale deeds seized by the CBI on 22.02.2014 from the office of M/s PGF Ltd. at New Delhi are a subject matter of case titled as M/s PGF Ltd. & others Vs. Union of India.

Vide letter dated 09.06.2015 (Annexure R-12), the CBI addressed a communication to the Addl. Chief Secretary and Financial Commissioner, Revenue, Govt. of Haryana informing that during the course of the investigation conducted by the CBI it had transpired that M/s PACL had purchased land/property in its own name as well as in the name of it's associate companies/employees and other individuals by utilizing investors deposits and that it had seized 613 property related documents pertaining to various Districts in Haryana including 97 properties situated in Panchkula. In order to safeguard the interest of investors, the Addl. Chief Secretary and Financial Commissioner, Revenue, Govt. of Haryana was requested by the CBI to issue appropriate directions to the concerned land revenue officers and Sub-Registrars to ensure that no transfer or alienation of any such property is permitted without any prior NoC from the Court of competent jurisdiction or CBI. Pertinently, the list (Annexure R-12/A) annexed to the letter dated 09.06.2015 (Annexure R-12) relates to other property documents of District Panchkula seized by the CBI vide order dated 22.07.2014 and does not include the property in question.

Vide order dated 02.02.2016 passed in Subrata Bhattacharya Vs. Securities and Exchange Board of India, in Civil Appeal No.13301/2015 and connected matters (Writ Petition (Crl.) No.705, 1076 of 2014 titled PACL Ltd. Vs. CBI), taking note of the large-scale irregularities and need to safeguard investor interest, the Hon'ble Supreme Court directed the Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI) to constitute a Committee under the Chairmanship Justice RM Lodha. The Committee was entrusted with the responsibility of disposing of the land of M/s PACL and to utilize the sale proceeds so as to refund the investors. The CBI was also directed to handover the documents which might be required by the SEBI. Vide order dated 25.07.2016 in the above-mentioned case, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the connected matter titled as M/s PACL Ltd Vs. CBI restrained M/s PACL Ltd. along with its Directors, Promoters, Agents, Employees and its group and associate companies from selling transferring or otherwise alienating any property in which M/s PACL Ltd. has an interest. In furtherance of the same, vide letter dated 30.08.2016 (Annexure R-15) issued by the Justice (Retired) R.M. Lodha Committee and addressed to the Financial Commissioner & Secretary, Revenue and Disaster Management Department, Haryana Civil Secretariat, Sector 1, Chandigarh, it was conveyed that only the said Committee was authorized to sell properties of M/s PACL Ltd. or any properties in which M/s PACL Ltd. has any direct or indirect interest and a request was made to refrain from effecting any registration, mutation, sale or similar transaction in respect of such properties. The letter enclosed a list of 764 properties pertaining to different Districts of State of Haryana. Pertinently, the list (Annexure R-15/A) annexed to the letter dated 30.08.2016 (Annexure R-15) pertains to other property documents of District Panchkula seized by the CBI after 22.04.2014 and does not include the property in question.

Meanwhile, the CBI vide another letter dated 14.05.2018 (Annexure R-16) requested the Addl. Chief Secretary, Govt. of Haryana to direct land revenue officers and Sub-Registrars to obtain prior NoC from the Justice R.M. Lodha Committee before permitting any transfer or alienation of the land belonging to M/s PACL Ltd., M/s PGF Ltd. and its associate companies and industries. Along with letter, a list of 638 companies associated with M/s PACL Ltd. was annexed but no list of properties was enclosed. However, pertinently, M/s PGF Ltd. is mentioned in the list (Annexure P-10 with application CRM-14955-2026 in CRM-M-10902-2026)

Vide letter dated 31.05.2018 (Annexure R-17), in continuation of its earlier communication dated 09.06.2015 (Annexure R-12) and 14.05.2018 (Annexure R-16), the CBI informed the Addl. Chief Secretary, Govt. of Haryana that 169 additional titled deeds relating to properties of M/s PACL Ltd. and its associates companies had been seized during investigation. It was requested that the land revenue officers and Sub-Registrars be directed to obtain prior NOC from the Justice R.M. Lodha Committee before permitting any alienation or transfer. Pertinently, the letter dated 31.05.2018 (Annexure R-17) pertains to property documents seized by the CBI after 22.02.2014 and therefore, the land in question in the present case is not reflected in the said list (Annexure R-17/A) appended with the letter dated 31.05.2018.

On 07.08.2019 the SEBI issued a public notice (Annexure R-18) to the effect that only the Vikramjit Sen Committee was authorized to sell the properties of M/s PGF Ltd. or any property in which the PGF or its associates/subsidiaries have a direct or indirect interest. The notice also stated that the properties of M/s PGF Ltd. seized by CBI are listed on the SEBI website. The list of properties (Annexure R-19) seized by the CBI which is listed on SEBI's website shows all the aforementioned sale deed Nos.133, 134 both dated 05.05.2004, Sale Deed No.419 dated 16.06.2014 and Sale Deed No.452 dated 23.06.2014 listed at Sr. No.234, 238, 219 and 212.

Based on letter bearing No.1600-STR-1-2018/4897 dated 05.06.2018 (Annexure R-20), letter No.2091 RC No.BD1/ 2014/ E/0004/ CBI/BS & FC/New Delhi dated 14.05.2018 (Annexure R-16) of the CBI and in compliance of the letter dated 1593/Reader dated 25.10.2019 (Annexure R-21), Rapat No.110 was entered into the Rapat Roznamcha 2019-2020, Tehsil Raipur Rani whereby, it was directed to make an entry by red ink in the Jamabandi against the names of private/unknown persons so that the land could not be disposed of. The copy of the Rapat No.110 is appended as (Annexure R-22). In furtherance of Rapat No.110, the requisite entry with red ink was made in the concerned column of Jamabandi of the year 2018-2019. It must be reiterated here that along with the letter dated 14.05.2018 (Annexure R-16) there is a list of 638 companies including M/s PGF, part owner of the land in question.

While posted as Sub-Registrar, Raipur Rani, Panchkula, the petitioner/Joginder Sharma addressed a letter dated 10.12.2020 (Annexure R-24) to the Justice R.M. Lodha Committee seeking clarification regarding any objection to the execution of a sale deed presented by Surmukh Singh in village Raipur Rani where M/s PACL Ltd. and DFCL Ltd. are also part owner. In response to the said letter, an email dated 14.12.2020 (Annexure R-25) was sent to the petitioner informing him that the property referred to in the said letter had been seized by the CBI and he was apprised of a communication dated 30.08.2016 (Annexure R-15) whereby directions had been issued to the revenue authorities not to effect registration, mutation or sale of property belonging to M/s PACL Ltd. The petitioner sent another letter dated 24.12.2020 (Annexure R-26) to the Committee stating that the land owned by Surmukh Singh was not part of the properties attached in District Panchkula and requested a clarification regarding any objection to the registration of the sale deed presented by Surmukh Singh. Once again, the Committee vide a letter dated 22.01.2021 (Annexure R-27) made a reference to the email dated 14.12.2020 and the letter dated 30.08.2016 whereby revenue authorities had been directed not to effect registration, mutation, sale etc. of property belonging to M/s PACL Ltd. It was informed that the Committee had appointed Shri R.S. Virk, District Judge to hear objections/representations in respect of PACL Ltd. properties and the petitioner was requested to advise Surmukh Singh to submit his claims regarding the property to the office of Shri, R.S. Virk, District Judge.

However, it transpired during investigation of the present case that instead of approaching the Justice R.M. Lodha Committee or the office of Shri, R.S. Virk, the petitioner/Joginder Sharma with a view to circumvent the directions issued by the Committee adopted an alternative course, registered a GPA dated 04.01.2021 whereby Surmukh Singh transferred all his rights in the property in favour of Vikramjit Singh and Hardip Singh who further sold the land vide two separate sale deeds dated 02.01.2026 in favour of one Kunal

Chillana. Interestingly, the sale deeds were registered by Vikram Singla co-accused while posted as Sub-Registrar, Raipur Rani despite having clear knowledge of the directions issued by the competent authorities restraining registration, mutation sale or any form of alienation of the property. An FIR No.07 dated 24.04.2026 under Section 7(1) of PC Act and Section 61(2) of BNS, P.S. ACB Panchkula has been registered against Vikram Singla, Deepak Kumar (Kanungo), Narender Kumar (Patwari), Surmukh Singh and others.

It has come to light during the course of investigation that a letter dated 03.02.2023 (Annexure R-31) was issued by the Deputy Commissioner, Panchkula to the Tehsildar Raipur Rani with regard to removal of stay entries recorded in the revenue record and the Tehsildar was directed to furnish a report within a period of two days as to whether any error had been committed in recording stay entries or whether the stay pertains to the same land or any other land and whether any portion of the land had been omitted from the stay entry. In response to the said letter, the Tehsildar sought a report from the Patwari. The Patwari after going through the record gave a report dated 03.02.2023 (Annexure R-33) that if any person/company has any objection with regard to the stay entries recorded in the revenue record in terms of the Justice R.M. Lodha Committee and the CBI the remedy is to place objections before Shri R.S. Virk, District Judge. Pertinently, attached with the letter is a office memo of M/s PACL bearing No.443/6.10.2010 (Annexure R-32) containing details of the present sale 04 sale deeds (Annexures R-5 to R-8). The Tehsildar, Raipur Rani forwarded the report dated 06.02.2023 (Annexure R-34) to the Deputy Commissioner, Panchkula endorsing the Patwari's report dated 03.02.2023 (Annexure R-33). The said position has been reiterated by the Tehsildar addressed to the Investigating Officer vide letter dated 11.02.2026 (Annexure R34/A).

It has come to light during investigation that Baldev Kaur the mother of Kulbir Singh and Lakhbir Singh and who inherited this land on their demise submitted an application dated 26.09.2025 (Annexure R-35) before the SDO, Panchkula seeking removal of the stay entry allegedly wrongly recorded with respect to land situated in Raipur Rani and Shahpur. The application was marked by the SDO to the Tehsildar, Raipur Rani (Vikram Singla) for necessary action. Vikram Singla, Tehsildar marked the same to Narender Patwari who thereafter recorded Rapat No.64 dated 26.09.2025 (Annexure R-36) in the revenue record. In the said Rapat, he noted that he had examined letter No.1600STR-1-2018/4897 and Letter No.2091RCBI-1/2014(F)0004 dated 14.05.2018 (Annexure R-16) issued by the CBI and observed that the property of Baldev Kaur and her family was not reflected in the list annexed with the aforesaid letters. On this basis, the stay entry recorded in the revenue record pertaining to the land of Baldev Kaur was removed.

Even prior to the sanctioning of the mutation on 27.10.2025, Baldev Kaur executed a sale deed No.1109 dated 16.10.2025 (Annexure R-38) for land measuring 141 Kanals, 8 marlas and 7 Sarsai comprised in Hadbast No.210 situated in village Shahpur, Tehsil Raipur Rani, District Panchkula in favour of Naveen S/o Devender (first cousin of the petitioner) for an amount of Rs.1 crore. The details of the payments received by Baldev Kaur are as under:-

Sr. No.	Date	Received from	Amount
1.	05.09.2025	Devine Realtors as Token of land	Rs.50,000/-
2.	08.09.2025	Devine Realtors as Token Money	Rs.1,00,000/-
3.	01.10.2025	Devine Realtors	Rs.3,00,000/-
4.	09.10.2025	Devine Realtors	Rs.5,00,000/-
5.	15.10.2025	Devine Realtors	Rs.10,00,000/-
6.	07.11.2025	Naveen	Rs.20,00,000/-
7.	26.11.2025	Naveen	Rs.20,00,000/-
8.	19.12.2025	Naveen	Rs.20,00,000/-
9.		Total	Rs.79,50,000/-

Baldev Kaur transferred Rs.19,50,000/- on 10.11.2025 to the account of M/s Devine Realtors and the bank statement therefore reflects that against a total consideration of Rs.1 crore, Baldev Kaur has received a sum of Rs.60 lakhs from Naveen towards sale consideration. Pertinently payments have been made to Baldev Kaur by Naveen and M/s Devine Realtors even prior to 26.09.2025 i.e. before she moved an application for removal of the red entry.

On 06.11.2025 Naveen further sold the above land to four persons namely, Vishaljit Kumar, Munish Kumar, Rajan Goyal and Sanjay Kumar Singla vide four separate sale deeds all dated 06.11.2025 (Annexures

R-39 to R-42). The sale consideration in each sale deed was Rs.1,45,00,000/- each totalling Rs.5,80,00,000/-. A perusal of the bank statement of M/s Devine Realtors (proprietorship firm of Dinesh Sharma, real brother of of the petitioner-Joginder Sharma) would reveal that the firm has received a total of Rs.2,15,00,000/- from Sanjay Kumar Singla, Munish Kumar and Vishaljit Kumar, the details of which are as under:-

Sr. No.	Date	Received in the A/c of Devine Realtors from	Amount
1.	25.08.2025	Sanjay Kumar Singla	Rs.35,00,000/-
2.	04.09.2025	Munish Kumar	Rs.20,00,000/-
3.	04.09.2025	Munish Kumar	Rs.20,00,000/-
4.	04.09.2025	Krishan Kumar (father of Rajan Goyal)	Rs.40,00,000/-
5.	09.09.2025	Sanjay Kumar Singla	Rs.10,00,000/-
6.	11.09.2025	Vishaljit Kumar	Rs.10,00,000/-
7.	15.09.2025	(Krishan Kumar (father of Rajan Goyal)	Rs.40,00,000/-
8.	10.10.2025	Krishan Kumar (father of Rajan Goyal)	Rs.20,00,000/-
9.	10.10.2025	Sanjay Kumar Singla	Rs.10,00,000/-
10.	10.10.2025	Vishaljit Kumar	Rs.10,00,000/-
11.		Total	Rs.2,15,00,000/-

Naveen has received a total sum of Rs.3,75,00,000/- from Sanjay Kumar Singla, Munish Kumar and Vishaljit Kumar. The details of the same are as under:-

Sr. No.	Date	Received in the A/c of Naveen from	Amount
1.	06.10.2025	Vishaljit Kumar	Rs.25,00,000/-
2.	06.10.2025	Sanjay Kumar	Rs.25,00,000/-
3.	03.11.2025	Rajan Goyal	Rs.10,00,000/-
4.	06.11.2025	Sanjay Kumar	Rs.45,00,000/-
5.	06.11.2025	Vishaljit Kumar	Rs.45,00,000/-
6.	07.11.2025	Rajan Goyal	Rs.30,00,000/-
7.	07.11.2025	Munish Kumar	Rs.45,00,000/-
8.	07.11.2025	Vishaljit Kumar	Rs.30,00,000/-
9.	12.11.2025	Munish Kumar	Rs.45,00,000/-
10.	18.11.2025	Sanjay Kumar	Rs.45,00,000/-
11.	18.11.2025	Sanjay Kumar	Rs.30,00,000/-
12.		Total	Rs.3,75,00,000/-

It has been brought to the notice of this Court that a sum of Rs.35 lakhs has been returned to the subsequent purchasers by Naveen/Devine Realtors. Pertinently, the payments have been made by the four purchasers to

Naveen Sharma and M/s Devine Realtors even prior to the sale deed dated 06.11.2025.

6. The learned Senior counsel for Joginder Sharma (petitioner in CRM-M-10902-2026) contends that the initial case against Tehsildar Vikram Singla and Baldev Kaur was only to the effect that Pearl Group land which had been restrained from being sold had been sold after fraudulently removing the red-ink mark in the revenue record. The land reverted to the owner Baldev Kaur who sold the same to Naveen S/o Devender (first cousin of the petitioner). Naveen further sold the land to four persons and the sale consideration was received by Naveen and Devine Realtors (the proprietorship firm of Dinesh Sharma, real brother of the petitioner-Joginder Sharma). Thereafter, on the statement of the buyers and on the basis of the evidence collected the petitioner came to be nominated as accused. He contends that the petitioner has not been named in the FIR and there is no evidence of demand, acceptance or recovery of any illegal gratification. The red-ink entry was removed as there was no evidence of there being any restriction on the sale of the said land. Rapat No.110 dated 25.10.2019 is based primarily on a letter dated 14.05.2018 (Annexure R-16) addressed by the CBI to the ACS, Haryana which contains a list of 638 companies affiliated to M/s PGF Ltd./M/s PACL Ltd. owning property but there is no property list enclosed. The other two letters referred to in the Rapat are based on the letter dated 14.05.2018 only. Once there was no bar to the sale of the said property, Baldev Kaur was well within her right to get the entry removed and sell the property. He contends that there is absolutely no nexus between the petitioner

and the alleged transaction who was posted as an L.A.O. at Pancchkula. The entry was removed by Tehsildar Vikram Singla on an application being moved by Baldev Kaur. Merely because the property was subsequently purchased by a nephew and real brother of the petitioner and thereafter further sold by them would not further the prosecution case against the petitioner as no such assumption can be drawn that the petitioner had any role in either the removal of the red-ink entry or the subsequent sale of the property. As regards the statements of the four purchasers of the property, the same would have limited evidentiary value as they ought to have been made accused and not witnesses. The petitioner has cooperated with the investigation and no recovery of any incriminating article has been effected from him. The case is otherwise based on documentary evidence. Therefore, as he is a respectable citizen and a Govt. servant and is not likely to flee from justice and otherwise is ready and willing to join investigation once again, he be granted the concession of anticipatory bail.

7. The learned Senior counsel for Baldev Kaur (petitioner in CRM-M-13239-2026) contends that she is an illiterate widow of the age of 76 years who has lost not only her husband but both her sons from whom the land devolved upon her. In fact, she has been nominated as an accused on account of her being the real sister of late Nirmal Singh Bhangoo who was the Managing Director of Pearl Group as well as the fact that the land which was sold was owned by her. She being an illiterate lady has been misled by property dealers as also the various officials of the Revenue Department. As per the impugned order it was accused Vikram Singla who maintained a

nexus with property dealers who acquired attached properties at lower value and realize undue gains thereby causing loss to the State. The petitioner being an illiterate lady has been induced into executing the sale deed by the aforesaid persons. In FIR No.15 dated 23.02.2021 U/s 420, 421, 188 and 120-B of IPC, P.S. Budladha, Mansa, the petitioner has already been granted the concession of anticipatory bail. As she is ready and willing to join investigation, she be granted the similar concession in the present case as well.

8. On the other hand, the learned State counsel along with the counsel for the victims/investors in M/s PGF Ltd./M/s PACL Ltd. with respect to petitioner/Joginder Sharma contend that he is a Revenue Officer posted in the District for the last many years. He was well-aware that the land owned by M/s PGF Ltd./M/s PACL Ltd. and associate companies and by relatives/associates of the promoters could not have been sold without due permission of the Justice R.M. Lodha Committee/Justice Vikramjit Sen Committee. While posted as a Tehsildar at Raipur Rani, Panchkula in the year 2020, the petitioner had attempted to get sold land of one Surmukh Singh where M/s PACL Ltd. was a part owner. Interestingly, Surmukh Singh is also part owner of the 700 kanals out of which 141 kanal has been sold now. Vide communication (Annexures R-24 to R-27) he sought clarification for sale from the Justice R.M. Lodha Committee and was denied permission and was instead directed to approach Shri R.S. Virk (retired) District Judge seeking permission to sell. However, instead of approaching Mr. R.S. Virk of the Justice R.M. Lodha Committee, he got executed an GPA of Surmukh Singh in

favour of another person. Then Vikram Singla, the accused in the present case executed sale deeds on the basis of the GPA in favour of two persons for which FIR No.7 dated 24.04.2026 (Annexure R-30) U/s 7(1) of P.C. Act and 61(2) of BNS, 2023, P.S. State Vigilance & Anti Corruption Bureau, ACB, Panckhula stands registered. Therefore, the petitioner was well-aware that the land belonging to M/s PGF Ltd./M/s PACL Ltd. /relatives and associates of the promoters could not have been sold.

As regards the present case, they contend that letter dated 14.05.2018 (Annexure R-16) the basis of the red-ink entry in Rapat No.110 whereby the CBI requested the Addl. Chief Secretary & Financial Commissioner, Revenue, Haryana to take prior NoC from the Justice R.M. Lodha Committee before permitting transfer of M/s PGF Ltd./M/s PACL Ltd. land has enclosed with it a list of 638 companies associated with M/s PACL Ltd. owning land. M/s PGF Ltd. is one such land owning company. Part of the 700 kanals attached out of which 141 kanal has been sold was owned by M/s PGF Ltd. Despite this fact, the red-ink entry has been removed from the revenue record. Further, the public notice issued by SEBI dated 07.08.2019 (Annexure R-18) to the effect that sale deeds are prohibited without an NoC has a list of properties posted on the website (Annexure R-19) where the four sale deeds (Annexures R-5 to R-8) recovered on 22.02.2014 from the office premises of M/s PGF Ltd. at Paschim Vihar, New Delhi are duly mentioned. Still further, the report of the Patwari dated 03.02.2023 (Annexure R-33) is clear and unequivocal that, if any, party had any objection to red-ink/stay of sale entry, they can approach the Justice R.M. Lodha Committee. Attached with the letter is an Office Memo No.443 dated 06.10.2010 (Annexure R-32) containing details of sale deeds (Annexures R-5 to R-8). This report has been approved by senior officers. They thus, contend that all these documents which the revenue officials are aware of and are part of the record of the Tehsil would show that the land in question could not have been sold after removing the red-ink mark on the Jamabandi and the same was done with a malicious intent to sell the property which could not have been sold.

They further contend that the involvement of the petitioner can also be ascertained from another fact. After removal of the red-ink entry on the application of Baldev Kaur, she executed a sale deed in favour of Naveen S/o Devender, the cousin of the petitioner on 16.10.2025 for an amount of Rs.1 crore. Interestingly, the application for removal of the red-ink entry is dated 26.09.2025. However, payments were being made to Baldev Kaur by Devine Realtors (a proprietorship firm owned by Dinesh Sharma, the real brother of the petitioner-Joginder Sharma) from 05.09.2025 onwards as is evident from the chart reproduced hereinabove. Interestingly, Devine Realtors and Naveen paid a sum of Rs.79,50,000/- to Baldev Kaur and Baldev Kaur has transferred Rs.19,50,000/- back to the account of Devine Realtors. Therefore, as against a sale consideration of Rs.1 crore, Baldev Kaur has received only Rs.60 crores. Naveen, the cousin of the petitioner thereafter executed four sale deeds in favour of Vishaljit Kumar, Munish Kumar, Rajan Goyal and Sanjay Kumar Singla for an amount of Rs.1.45 crores each. Interestingly, once again, Rs.2.15 crores has been received by way of sale proceeds by Devine Realtors whereas Rs.3.75 crores has been received by

Naveen. The financial trail and the timing of the payments clearly establishes that the red-ink mark was got removed with prior concert between the petitioner, Vikram Singla, Baldev Kaur and others with a view to facilitate the sale of the property firstly to Naveen, the cousin of the petitioner and to Dinesh Sharma, the real brother of the petitioner who thereafter sold the land to other four persons.

They contend that three purchasers namely, Rajan Goyal, Vishaljit Kumar and Sanjay Kumar Singla have also got recorded their statements under Section 180 of BNSS, 2023 wherein they have clearly enumerated the active role played by the petitioner in the entire transaction and the money received by him. Further, Vishaljit Kumar and Rajan Goyal have provided audio recordings conversation between them and petitioner-Joginder Sharma which also goes to substantiate that the petitioner is the prime conspirator in the removal of the red-ink entry and the subsequent sale of the land.

As the offence are *prima facie* made out and the investigation is to be taken to its logical conclusion, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner/Joginder Sharma is certainly required and therefore, he is not entitled to the concession of anticipatory bail.

9. The learned State counsel along with the counsel for the victims/investors in M/s PGF Ltd./M/s PACL Ltd. with respect to petitioner/Baldev Kaur contend that she being an accused in FIR No.15 dated 23.02.2021 which also pertains to Pearl Group Land was aware that the land belonging to the Pearl Group of which M/s PGF Ltd. and M/s PACL Ltd. are

part could not have been sold. During the investigation, the statement of Kamaljit Kaur widow of Kulvir Singh, the deceased son of the petitioner from whom the land devolved upon her was recorded wherein she stated that she did not know as to when the petitioner had got registered the land in her name though she (Kamaljit Kaur) would also have been a legal heir of any land owned by her deceased husband Kulvir Singh. Harpreet Singh, the son-in-law of the petitioner who is a witness to all proceedings i.e. mutation, sale deed proceedings etc. is also an accused in the present case and is absconding. The time-line within which the transactions have taken place are also telling. The petitioner started receiving part sale consideration from M/s Devine Realtors from 05.09.2025. The application to remove the stay entry was moved by the petitioner only on 26.09.2025. The sale deed was executed by the petitioner in favour of Naveen for an amount of Rs.1 crore on 16.10.2025. However, she received only Rs.79.50 lakhs out of which she returned Rs.19.5 lakhs to M/s Devine Realtors thereby receiving a total sale consideration of Rs.60 lakhs as against Rs.1 crore. Soon thereafter on 06.11.2025 Naveen sold the land to four persons for a total amount of Rs.5,80,00,000/- and the sale consideration was received by M/s Devine Realtors and Naveen. Quite interestingly, the four purchasers were making payments to M/s Devine Realtors from 25.08.2025 itself, even prior to the petitioner moving an application on 26.09.2025 seeking removal of the stay entry. They contend that all the accused including the petitioners have conspired together to sell the land which sale was prohibited at a throw away price. They thus, contend that the petitioner does not deserve any sympathy being a second time offender particularly when her custodial interrogation is required to facilitate the investigation and to fill up the loopholes in the same.

10. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

11. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Sumitha Pradeep Vs. Arun Kumar C.K. & Anr.*** ***2022 Live Law (SC) 870*** held that merely because custodial interrogation was not required by itself could not be a ground to grant anticipatory bail. The first and the foremost thing the Court hearing the anticipatory bail application is to consider is the prima facie case against the accused. The relevant extract of the judgment is reproduced hereinbelow:-

> "*It may be true, as pointed out by learned counsel appearing for Respondent No.1, that charge-sheet has already been filed. It will be unfair to presume on our part that the Investigating Officer does not require Respondent No.1 for custodial interrogation for the purpose of further investigation.*
>
> *Be that as it may, even assuming it a case where Respondent No.1 is not required for custodial interrogation, we are satisfied that the High Court ought not to have granted discretionary relief of anticipatory bail.*
>
> *We are dealing with a matter wherein the original complainant (appellant herein) has come before this Court praying that the anticipatory bail granted by the High Court to the accused should be cancelled. To put it in other words, the complainant says that the High Court wrongly exercised its discretion while granting anticipatory bail to the accused in a very serious crime like POCSO and, therefore, the order passed by the High Court granting anticipatory bail to the accused should be quashed and set aside.* ***In many anticipatory bail matters, we have noticed one common argument being canvassed that no custodial interrogation is required and,***

> ***therefore, anticipatory bail may be granted. There appears to be a serious misconception of law that if no case for custodial interrogation is made out by the prosecution, then that alone would be a good ground to grant anticipatory bail. Custodial interrogation can be one of the relevant aspects to be considered along with other grounds while deciding an application seeking anticipatory bail. There may be many cases in which the custodial interrogation of the accused may not be required, but that does not mean that the prima facie case against the accused should be ignored or overlooked and he should be granted anticipatory bail. The first and foremost thing that the court hearing an anticipatory bail application should consider is the prima facie case put up against the accused. Thereafter, the nature of the offence should be looked into along with the severity of the punishment. Custodial interrogation can be one of the grounds to decline custodial interrogation. However, even if custodial interrogation is not required or necessitated, by itself, cannot be a ground to grant anticipatory bail***.

12. In ***Devinder Kumar Bansal Vs. The State of Punjab, 2025(4) SCC 493,*** the Hon'ble Supreme Court held as under:-

> *"21. The parameters for grant of anticipatory bail in a serious offence like corruption are required to be satisfied. Anticipatory bail can be granted only in exceptional circumstances where the Court is prima facie of the view that the applicant has been falsely enroped in the crime or the allegations are politically motivated or are frivolous. So far as the case at hand is concerned, it cannot be said that any exceptional circumstances have been made out by the petitioner accused for grant of anticipatory bail and there is no frivolity in the prosecution.*
>
> *22. In the aforesaid context, we may refer to a pronouncement in Central Bureau of Investigation v. V. Vijay Sai Reddy reported in (2013) 7 Scale 15, wherein this Court expressed thus:*

> *"28. While granting bail, the court has to keep in mind the nature of accusation, the nature of evidence in support thereof, the severity of the punishment which conviction will entail, the character of the accused, circumstances which are peculiar to the accused, reasonable possibility of securing the presence of the accused at the trial, reasonable apprehension of the witnesses being tampered with, the larger interests of the public/State and other similar considerations. It has also to be kept in mind that for the purpose of granting bail, the Legislature has used the words "reasonable grounds for believing" instead of "the evidence" which means the Court dealing with the grant of bail can only satisfy it as to whether there is a genuine case against the accused and that the prosecution will be able to produce prima facie evidence in support of the charge. It is not expected, at this stage, to have the evidence establishing the guilt of the accused beyond reasonable doubt."*
>
> *(Emphasis supplied)*

23. The presumption of innocence, by itself, cannot be the sole consideration for grant of anticipatory bail. The presumption of innocence is one of the considerations, which the court should keep in mind while considering the plea for anticipatory bail. The salutary rule is to balance the cause of the accused and the cause of public justice. Over solicitous homage to the accused's liberty can, sometimes, defeat the cause of public justice.

24. If liberty is to be denied to an accused to ensure corruption free society, then the courts should not hesitate in denying such liberty. Where overwhelming considerations in the nature aforesaid require denial of anticipatory bail, it has to be denied. It is altogether a different thing to say that once the investigation is over and charge-sheet is filed, the court may consider to grant regular bail to a public servant - accused of indulging in corruption.

25. Avarice is a common frailty of mankind and Robert Walpole's famous pronouncement that all men have their price, *notwithstanding the unsavoury cynicism that it suggests, is not very far from truth. As far back as more than two centuries ago, it was Burke who cautioned: "Among a people generally corrupt, liberty cannot last long". In more recent years, Romain Rolland lamented that France fell because there was corruption without indignation. Corruption has, in it, very dangerous potentialities. Corruption, a word of wide connotation has, in respect of almost all the spheres of our day to day life, all the world over, the limited meaning of allowing decisions and actions to be influenced not by the rights or wrongs of a case but by the prospects of monetary gains or other selfish considerations.*

26. If even a fraction of what was the vox pupuli about the magnitude of corruption to be true, then it would not be far removed from the truth, that it is the rampant corruption indulged in with impunity by highly placed persons that has led to economic unrest in this country. If one is asked to name one sole factor that effectively arrested the progress of our society to prosperity, undeniably it is corruption. If the society in a developing country faces a menace greater than even the one from the hired assassins to its law and order, then that is from the corrupt elements at the higher echelons of the Government and of the political parties."

(Emphasis supplied)

13. In ***Kewal Singh Vs. State of Punjab, 2025(2) Law Herald 1736***, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held as under:-

"*9. It is well settled law, and reaffirmed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Devinder Kumar Bansal v. State of Punjab, 2025 INSC 320 that anticipatory bail in cases involving offences under the Corruption Act is to be granted only in the rarest of rare circumstances. The court is required to be prima facie satisfied either of false implication, political vendetta, or manifest frivolity in the complaint.*

> *10. In the present case, no such circumstances are made out. On the contrary, the specific allegations supported by preliminary material including the trap proceedings, indicate a prima facie involvement of the petitioner in the commission of the alleged offence.*
>
> *11. In view of the seriousness of the allegations, the position of trust held by the petitioner as a public servant, and the need for thorough investigation through custodial interrogation, this Court finds no ground to extend the extraordinary concession of the anticipatory bail to the petitioner."*

(Emphasis supplied)

14. In ***Jatin Salwan Versus Central Bureau of Investigation, 2026(1) RCR (Criminal) 702*** wherein the allegations were that a lawyer sought illegal gratification to influence judicial proceedings, regular bail was declined by the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

15. In ***Harcharan Singh Bhullar Versus Union of India & others etc., SLP (Crl.) Nos.20917-20918/2025*** where the allegations were that a Senior Police Officer was demanding and accepting illegal gratification through an intermediary, regular bail was declined by the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

16. Coming back to the facts of the present case, a perusal of the documents on record would reveal that the letter dated 14.05.2018 (Annexure R-16) addressed by CBI to the Addl. Chief Secretary and Financial Commissioner, Revenue, Govt. of Haryana prohibiting sale of properties belonging to M/s PGF Ltd. /M/s PACL Ltd. /associate companies without prior permission from the Justice R.M. Lodha Committee has attached with it

a list of 638 companies associated with M/s PGF Ltd./M/s PACL. Ltd. M/s PGF Ltd. is one such company in the said list of 638 companies. As has been argued, the 700 kanal purchased vide sale deeds (Annexures R-5 to R-8) is partly owned by M/s PGF Ltd. and therefore, could not have been sold without prior permission of the Justice R.M. Lodha Committee.

The Public Notice issued by SEBI dated 07.08.2019 (Annexure R-18) also prohibits sale of the land without permission of the Committee. The list of properties (Annexure R-19) posted on the website of SEBI include the four sale deeds at Sr. Nos.212, 219, 234 & 238 of the list.

Vide letter dated 03.02.2023 (Annexure R-31) the Deputy Commissioner, Panchkula had asked the Tehsildar, Raipur Rani whether stay entries had been wrongly removed. The Patwari gave a report dated 03.02.2023 (Annexure R-33) to the Tehsildar that, if any company/individual had any objection to the prohibition of sale of its property, it was free to approach Shri R.S. Virk of the Justice R.M. Lodha Committee. Attached with this letter is a office memo No.443 (Annexure R-32) dated 06.10.2010 containing the details of the original sale deeds (Annexures R-5 to R-8).

The aforementioned documents are part of the revenue record of the Tehsil office. However, Baldev Kaur in conspiracy with Joginder Sharma, LAO, Panchkula and Vikram Singla, the then Tehsildar and other revenue officials got removed the red-ink entry prohibiting sale by deliberately not referring to other relevant documents on record prohibiting sale and sold the land without permission of the Justice R.M. Lodha Committee.

17. Another fact which would establish the allegations against Joginder Sharma is that while posted as Tehsildar, Raipur Rani in the year 2020 on the application of one Surmukh Singh, part owner of the 700 kanals, the petitioner had written to the Justice R.M. Lodha Committee asking it as to whether Surmukh Singh could sell another parcel of his land where M/s PACL Ltd. was a part owner. The Justice R.M. Lodha Committee responded by saying that the land could not be sold without permission. The communications are on record as Annexures R-24 to R-27 respectively. Despite the said fact, Joginder Sharma got Surmukh Singh to execute a power of attorney in favour of another person and thereafter based on the said power of attorney, Vikram Singla the then Tehsildar executed two sale deeds. An FIR No.07 dated 24.04.2026 (Annexure R-30) U/s 7(1) of P.C. Act and 61(2) of BNS, 2023, P.S. State Vigilance & Anti Corruption Bureau, ACB, Panckhula stands registered against Vikram Singla and others. This allegation too shows that the Joginder Sharma and Vikram Singla were very well-aware of the fact that the land owned by M/s PGF Ltd./M/s PACL Ltd./their affiliated companies and associates could not have been sold without permission of the Justice R.M. Lodha Committee.

18. The financial trail also establishes the role of Joginder Sharma. Even prior to the execution of the sale deed, Baldev Kaur received sale consideration from Naveen, the cousin of Joginder Sharma and Devine Realtors, a proprietorship of Dinesh Sharma, the real brother of Joginder Sharma. As per record, Baldev Kaur received a sum of Rs.79.5 lakhs as against a total sale consideration of Rs.1 crore. Rs.19.5 lakhs was returned

back to M/s Devine Realtors. Effectively, Baldev Kaur sold the land for Rs.60 lakhs only. Some of their payments have been made even prior to Baldev Kaur moving an application on 26.09.2025 seeking removal of the stay entry. Thereafter, Naveen executed four sale deeds in favour of four persons namely, Vishaljit Kumar, Munish Kumar, Rajan Goyal and Sanjay Kumar Singla for a sum of Rs.1.45 crores. Once again, payments have been received from the purchasers by Naveen and M/s Devine Realtors and some of those payments are even prior to the execution of the respective sale deeds as is apparent from the chart hereinabove.

19. The statements of Rajan Goyal, Vishaljit Singh and Sanjay Kumar Singla (Annexures R-47 to 49), the subsequent purchasers of the land from Naveen also establish the role played by Joginder Sharma in facilitating the entire scam.

20. The State has filed a comprehensive affidavit dated 11.05.2026 of Vijay Kumar Nehra, DSP, P.S. State Vigilance & Anti-Corruption Bureau, Panchkula in CRM-M-10902-2026. The relevant extract of the same is reproduced hereinbelow:-

> *5. Knowledge of Land Status and Deliberate Removal of Stay Entry:- That Patwari's Report dated 03.02.2023 (Annexure R-33) and Tehsildar's Report dated 06.02.2023 (Annexure R-34) formed part of the official revenue record maintained in the Tehsil Office, Raipur Rani and was duly available in the concerned revenue files. Therefore, it can safely be presumed that the petitioner and his co-accused, had full knowledge of the true status and history of the land in question. Despite the availability of such official record clearly reflecting the connection of the property with PACL Ltd. and the proceedings relating thereto, said report was deliberately ignored*

and concealed while removing the stay entry from the revenue record. The deliberate non-consideration of such material record, which was readily available in the Tehsil Office itself, clearly indicates a conscious and intentional act aimed at facilitating illegal transfer and sale of the property in question.

6. That a Public Notice dated 07.08.2019 (Annexure R-18) was duly issued by Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI), and the List of Properties (Annexure R-19) was uploaded on the official website of SEBI categorically declaring that only the Committee constituted pursuant to the orders of the competent Court/Authority was authorized to sell or otherwise deal with the properties mentioned therein. The said public notice was issued in the public domain for the specific purpose of informing all concerned persons and authorities about the restrictions operating upon such properties. Consequently, the petitioner, co- accused, purchasers, as well as the concerned revenue authorities, are deemed to have complete knowledge of the prohibition and restrictions relating to the sale and transfer of the property in question. In spite of such explicit public notice and official declaration, the accused persons deliberately ignored and circumvented the restrictions and proceeded with the illegal transfer and sale of the property, thereby demonstrating their conscious involvement and dishonest intention.

Role of petitioner and the evidence collected in this regard

7. That the petitioner is the principal conspirator, kingpin and ultimate beneficiary of the entire illegal transaction. He not only conceived the criminal conspiracy in connivance with co-accused Vikram Singla, but also remained actively involved at every stage of its execution. The material collected during investigation clearly establishes his conscious, deliberate and calculated role in the commission of the offence. Despite being fully aware of the actual legal status of the land, the petitioner, in collusion with Narender Dabas (Patwari), Vikram Singla (Tehsildar) and other co-accused, first managed to get the stay over the land removed through illegal means. In furtherance of the conspiracy, huge amounts of illegal *gratification running into lakhs of rupees were paid to public servants. Significantly, an amount of Rs. 10 lakhs was transferred to the account of the wife of Narender Dabas, Patwari. During investigation, accused Vikram Singla also disclosed that he was paid Rs. 25 lakhs for facilitating registration of the illegal sale deed. Further instances of payment of illegal gratification are still under verification. The petitioner also misused his official position as DRO/LAO to influence prospective purchasers by falsely representing that the land was free from all legal encumbrances. Thereafter, the petitioner received an amount of Rs. 2.39 crores in cash on different dates, namely Rs. 50 lakhs on 29.09.2025, Rs. 65 lakhs on 01.10.2025, Rs. 45 lakhs on 04.10.2025, Rs. 55 lakhs on 06.10.2025, Rs. 20.50 lakhs on 19.10.2025 and Rs. 4 lakhs on 26.10.2025, apart from Rs. 5.90 crores received through banking channels from the purchasers. Out of the said amount, Rs. 2.15 crores was transferred to the account of M/s Devine Realtors, a firm belonging to his brother Dinesh Sharma, whereas Rs. 3.75 crores was credited to the bank account of the petitioner's cousin Naveen on different dates mentioned hereinabove. The said amounts were thereafter routed to various persons either directly by the petitioner or at his instance through Naveen's account, clearly reflecting his complete control over the illegal operation and the deliberate layering of funds to conceal the proceeds of crime. Further, as per the statement of Jatinder Sharma, the petitioner even utilized part of the cash proceeds on two occasions for gambling activities. A true copy of the statement of Jatinder Sharma is appended as Annexure R-54.*

8. That during the course of investigation, the statements of Rajan Goyal, Vishaljit Kumar and Sanjay Kumar have been duly recorded under law. A careful and conjoint reading of these statements unequivocally establishes that the petitioner was not a mere bystander but an active participant in the entire transaction from its very inception. The said witnesses have specifically attributed a direct and substantive role to the petitioner in planning, facilitating *and executing the illegal acts in question. Their consistent and corroborative testimonies clearly demonstrate the petitioner's deep-rooted involvement in the conspiracy, thereby prima facie establishing his complicity in the commission of the offences alleged. Similarly, statement of Jitender Sharma also clearly establish petitioner's complicity in the commission of the offences alleged.*

9. That the audio recordings of the telephonic conversations, supplied by Vishaljit Kumar and Rajan Goyal, clearly reveal that the petitioner was not a mere bystander but an active and conscious participant in the entire transaction right from its inception. The contents of the said conversations demonstrate that the petitioner was fully aware of all material aspects of the transaction and was actively coordinating, negotiating and influencing the course of events at every stage. The recordings further establish his direct involvement in the conspiracy and corroborate the prosecution case that the transaction was being executed under his instructions, guidance and control. The said audio conversations thus constitute crucial incriminating material, clearly reflecting the petitioner's central role in the commission of the offences in question.

10. That the investigation conducted thus far has further revealed that the petitioner, in active connivance with co-accused Vikram Singla, was also instrumental in facilitating the sale of other similarly situated land in the Raipur Rani area to private persons by adopting an almost identical modus operandi. The material collected during investigation indicates that the petitioner and his associates systematically targeted lands having legal restrictions/disputes and, through abuse of official position, manipulation of revenue records and collusion with public servants, got such properties transferred in favour of private parties for wrongful gain. The facts emerging during investigation clearly establish that the present case is not an isolated or standalone transaction, but forms part of a larger, well-planned and organized criminal conspiracy being executed in a repetitive and systematic manner. The recurring pattern of illegal conduct, involvement of *multiple persons, abuse of official machinery and movement of huge amounts of money demonstrate the deep-rooted nature and wider ramifications of the offence. The gravity, magnitude and organized nature of the crime clearly disentitle the petitioner from the discretionary relief sought in the present petition, particularly when custodial interrogation is necessary to unearth the entire conspiracy, identify other beneficiaries and trace the proceeds of crime.*

11. That the petitioner actively participated in and attended multiple meetings with the purchasers in relation to the impugned transactions and remained in constant contact with them through regular phone calls and app-based communications, clearly evidencing his direct involvement and conscious participation in the fraudulent conspiracy. The continuous interaction and coordination by the petitioner at every stage of the transaction unmistakably establish that he was not a passive observer but a key facilitator and controlling figure in the entire scheme. The said fact stands duly corroborated from the analysis of the relevant Call Detail Records pertaining to Mobile Nos. 9878933333 and 9814103333 belonging to the petitioner, which reveal frequent and consistent communication with the concerned parties connected with the illegal transaction.

12. The petitioner was joined in the investigation of present case on 14.02.2026 and he was asked questions relevant to the case. However, he didn't cooperate and gave false and/or evasive replies. He was again joined in investigation on 16.02.2026. However, he continued his non-cooperation. The issue related to non-cooperation is substantiated on the basis of following points: -

I. Investigation has revealed that petitioner/accused remained in constant touch with co-accused as well as purchasers of the property in question etc. through physical meetings, mobile phone calls and whatsapp calls etc. as mentioned above, however he deliberately refused to get his both mobile phones recovered. Instead, he has taken a false plea that he has lost his mobile phones while travelling to Salasar Rajasthan. It is *notable that he neither lodged any report/complaint to local jurisdictional police station/other police station nor reported the same on any online portal. The conduct of the petitioner/accused clearly reflects a deliberate and calculated attempt to destroy and withhold crucial electronic evidence in investigation.*

II. Instead of producing the relevant two mobile phones being used by him during the period of commission of offence, Petitioner/accused produced two other mobile phones (one earlier being used by his wife/children and one purchased in this week as stated by petitioner). Despite these phones not being actual phones required for investigation purpose, these phones were taken into police possession and sent to Cyber Forensic Lab to retrieve relevant data, if available, however CFL report clearly reveals that there is no data available in these phones thus, actual mobile phone which are still in possession of petitioner were not deliberately produced.

III. The claim of petitioner that he lost his mobile phone after registration of FIR is totally false and misleading on following grounds that -

(i). On 14.02.2026, the petitioner stated that he lost his both mobile phones while travelling to Salasar on 30.01.2026 (date of visiting Salasar as stated on 16.02.2026) whereas on 17.02.2026, he stated that he lost his mobile phone while he was going to Khatu Shyam Ji temple after parking his car. The distance between Salasar to Khatu Shyam ji is around 115 KMs. He even didn't know how much money also he had lost.

(ii) He neither reported the loss of mobile phones to report to service providers for de-activation of SIM cards to prevent possible misuse nor to local Police/online portal meant for this purpose. Further, he stated that he didn't make any effort to trace the lost mobile phones.

(iii) The IMEI numbers of the mobile phones presented by petitioner on 18.02.2026 to the Investigating Agency and the mobile phones being used by petitioner at the time of

commission of offence are altogether different. It clearly reveals that petitioner/accused has concocted a false story so that Investigating agency can't get his phone examined from Cyber Forensic Lab. Mobile phones used during commission of offence by petitioner/accused are very much relevant and vital piece to evidence in the matter.

(iv) The Analysis of CDR shows that though one mobile number 9878933333 was lastly active till 07:28 PM on 31.01.2026 as per CDR, however, due to forwarded calls, tower location were not given by service provider. On this day, his location was already in Salasar since morning time. Thus, petitioner's claim that he lost mobile phone while he was going to Salasar is totally false. It is further pertinent to mention here that he forwarded the calls to an inactive number on 31.01.2026.

(v) The last tower location of another number 9814103333 is in Jhajjar District on 30.01.2026 on 07:45. Tower location analysis shows that he deliberately switched off his both mobile phone and didn't lose the same in Khatu Shyamji as stated by him on 17.02.2026. As per IPDR, the last location of mobile number 9878933333 was Ramgarh Bypass Road Fatehpur Sikar on 31.01.2026 at 02:35 PM whereas last location of 9814103333 was Ramgarh Bypass Road Fatehpur Sikar at 02:37 PM on 31.01.2026. Distance between Fatehpur to Khatu Shyamji is around 90 KMs. Thus, this is just an attempt by petitioner to not to present mobile phones to Investigating Agency.

(vi) According to petitioner, he was carrying one phone in pocket of his trouser and another phone was pocket of Jacket and he lost his both mobile phones. Thus, this claim is totally unbelievable."

21. Baldev Kaur was the real sister of late Nirmal Singh Bhangoo the owner/promoter/Director of the Pearl Group of companies of which M/s PGF Ltd. and M/s PACL Ltd. are a part. She was well-aware of the fact that the land could not have been sold as she is an accused in an earlier FIR No.15

dated 23.02.2021 U/s 420, 421, 188 and 120-B of IPC, P.S. Budladha, Mansa concerning land belonging to the Pearl Group. The speed with which the transactions have been entered into between Baldev Kaur and Naveen on the one hand and Naveen and the subsequent purchasers on the other when seen in the context of the timelines of payments being made to Baldev Kaur and Naveen/Devine Realtors would establish that Baldev Kaur, her son-in-law Harpreet Singh who is a witness in all proceedings were well-aware of the fact that they were indulging in an illegal act in conspiracy with Joginder Sharma and others by selling the land in question. By no stretch of imagination can it be said that Baldev Kaur was unaware of her actions or that she was unaware of the fact that the land which had devolved upon her from her sons was free from encumbrances. As the offence stands *prima facie* established and the investigation is to be taken to it's logical conclusion the custodial interrogation of the petitioners is certainly required.

22. In view of the aforementioned discussion, I find no merit in the present petitions. Therefore, the same stand dismissed.

23. However, the observations made hereinabove are only for the purposes of deciding these bail petitions and the Trial Court is free to adjudicate upon the matter on the basis of the evidence led before it uninfluenced by any such observations made herein.

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

26.05.2026

JITESH

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