

CANCELLATION REPORT

State Vs. Unknown

FIR No. 56 dated 21.03.2026
Under Sections 331(4), 305 of the Bharatiya Nyaya
Sanhita (BNS), 2023
[corresponding to Sections 457, 380 of IPC, 1860]
Police Station:- Lahori Gate,
District- Patiala.

Present: Sh. Jatinderpal Singh Sharma, APP for the State.
Sh. Navdeep Sharma, Advocate, counsel for the complainant.

ORDER:-

Heard on the cancellation report submitted by the police.

Perusal of the file reveals that present cancellation report was
submitted by the police on 24.06.2026.

Complainant Dr. Bhupinder Singh Virk son of Amrik Singh
resident of House No.170, Bhadurgarh, District Patiala appeared on 24.06.2026 and
suffered statement to the effect that he is complainant in the present case and above
stated FIR was registered on his statement. He agrees with the cancellation report of
the police without prejudice to his rights. He further stated that he has no objection if
present cancellation report filed by the police is accepted. Complainant has been duly
identified by his counsel.

On the same day i.e. on 24.06.2026, Investigating Officer namely
ASI Nirankar Singh No.2180/Ptl. also came present and vide separate statement, he
has identified the complainant.

I have heard the learned counsel for complainant and the learned APP for the State.

Perusal of file as well as the contents of present cancellation report shows that present FIR was registered on the statement of complainant Dr. Bhupinder Singh Virk against accused Amarjot Kaur alias Pinki, Gaurav Goel and unknown persons wherein the complainant had alleged that he is working as a Professor in Department of Law, Punjabi University, Patiala. He and his friend Late Kanwaljit Singh, Learned Additional District Judge, Sangrur were friends and they studied together. On 01.08.2025, late Kanwaljit Singh had expired and on 01.08.2025 itself, when the dead body of late Kanwaljit Singh was lying at Amar Hospital, Patiala then at night at around 08:46 PM, the house maid namely Amarjot Kaur alias Pinki, Gaurav Goel, one Govt. Official (who was posted alongwith Late Kanwaljit Singh) and one unknown person came in cars at the house of Late Kanwaljit Singh on the night of 01.08.2025. CCTV's Cameras have been installed at the house of Late Kanwaljit Singh. Out of the above stated four persons, Gaurav stood outside and remaining three persons went inside the house and started searching the house. After search, all the three persons took alongwith them, ancestral gold, jewellery and cash in the bags. When Late Kanwaljit Singh died, his eldest son namely Angadpal Singh (who is working as an advocate in Canada) and younger son namely Arjan Pal Singh (who is studying in Canada) came and Angad Pal Singh gave Special Power of Attorney to the complainant on 16.08.2025. He stated that he has strong and cogent evidence against Amarjot Kaur alias Pinki and Gaurav Goel, one unknown person and one Govt. official

(who remained posted at Sangrur with deceased friend Sh. Kanwaljit Singh, Learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sangrur) which he would produce during investigation. He stated that after conducting deep inquiry, he has come to know that above stated 4 persons have committed theft in the house of his deceased friend Sh. Kanwaljit Singh, Learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sangrur. Action be taken against them for committing house trespass and theft of ancestral jewellery, gold and cash in the house of his deceased friend Sh. Kanwaljit Singh, Learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sangrur. On the basis of statement of complainant (special power of attorney holder), present FIR was registered. On 22.03.2026 accused Amarjot Kaur alias Pinki was arrested and on 23.03.2026 accused Gaurav Goel alias Gaggi was arrested. On 25.03.2026, on the basis of statement of the complainant, Bikramdeep Singh was nominated as accused in present case. During investigation, on 29.03.2026, complainant produced DVR HIKVISION color white and one mobile phone make One plus (colour silver without sim) which were taken into police possession. Statement of witnesses were recorded. On 16.04.2026, complainant submitted typed statement to the police wherein it is stated as under:

“Stated that Angadpal Singh and Arjanpal Singh are the sons of Late S. Kawaljeet Singh and are presently residing at H. No. 74/C Vikas Colony, Patiala, Late S. Kawaljeet Singh, who was posted as Additional District and Sessions Judge, Sangrur and he was expired on 01.08.2025 and was my childhood friend. His aforesaid sons are residing abroad at 359 Darcy street, Cobourg

Ontario Canada & /C Vikas Colony, Patiala from so many years and they used to visit India occasionally and before the death of their father S. Kawaljeet Singh, they lastly visited India 4 years ago. Death of my friend Late S. Kawaljeet Singh took Place suddenly and in mysterious circumstances and as per the maid and employees of my friend Late S. Kawaljeet Singh, Some articles alongwith cash were missing from his house i.e. House No. 74-C, Vikas Colony Patiala, as both the sons of Late S. Kawaljeet Singh were residing at abroad as such they were unable to verify the true & correct fact of stolen articles and cash missing from their house, as such they executed a special power of attorney in my favour and authorized me to appear, act & plead before the court authorities and to give documents on their behalf and on their instructions to the police, Local Authorities, Courts or to engage counsel etc. vide Special Power of Attorney dated 16.08.2025. As per the instructions of both the sons of Late. S. Kawaljeet Singh, I appeared before the Police Authorities, Court and engaged the counsel for them and I joined the investigation in the FIR No. 0056 dated 21.03.2026, Police Station Division No. 4, Patiala. Now after verifying the stolen articles from their house and as per information by near & dear ones, maid and officials of my deceased friend S. Kawaljeet Singh, both his sons came to know that their missing articles & cash were not stolen by

anybody but those articles & cash were missing but the same articles and cash were found in their house and this fact was cleared by one of his best friend of late S. Kawaljeet Singh. I, being special power of attorney holder of both the sons of S. Kawaljeet Singh, on their instructions I acted & pleaded before the authorities, investigation before the Police and the Court. The above said FIR was lodged due to misunderstanding and that misunderstanding has been resolved as stolen articles & cash were recovered from their house itself. Now, both the Sons of Late S. Kawaljeet Singh instructed me to act on their behalf and to appear before the Police, Authority of before the court that they do not pursue the aforesaid FIR No. 0056 dated 21.03.2026, Police Station Division No. 4, Patiala against anybody and as per the Instructions of both the sons of Late S. Kawaljeet Singh, I do not want to pursue with the aforesaid FIR as per their instructions and information provided by them that no articles & cash were stolen from their house.”

It is further stated in the present cancellation report that the cancellation report was filed by the police on 20.04.2026 which was rejected and was returned back to the concerned SHO with a direction to conduct further investigation as per law and to submit a fresh report after further investigation on the following grounds:

- i) Some of the articles were shown to be taken by some persons in the bags from the house of the deceased as per the CCTV footage. In this regard, the Investigating Officer was directed to investigate as to what articles were taken in the bags and how many articles have been recovered by the police? It was further directed to investigate as to if any recovery has been effected then mention details about date and place of said recovery.
- ii) Recording of statement of sons of deceased Kanwaljit Singh in the Court either in person or through video conferencing also finds mention in the order.

Thereafter, further investigation was conducted and one application bearing no. 2828/Peshi dated 22.04.2026 was received from Naginderjit Singh resident of [REDACTED] (father of accused Bikramdeep Singh) wherein he has prayed regarding innocence of accused Bikramdeep Singh. It is further stated in the cancellation report that various facts pertaining to present case were mentioned in the application filed by Naginderjit Singh. Bikramdeep Singh, son of the applicant Naginderjit Singh, was appointed as a Judicial Officer by the Government of Punjab. The deceased Judge Kanwaljit Singh and the Judge Bikramdeep Singh were friends and being in same profession, they used to visit each other's house. At the time of death of Judge Kanwaljit Singh, his two sons were not present with him, as his elder son Angadpal Singh was abroad in Canada and Arjunpal Singh was in Gurgaon outside Punjab. Due to which, Judge Bikramdeep Singh, considering the sensitivity of the situation, to provide moral support had made a call through WhatsApp on mobile number [REDACTED] [In this regard, copies of

screenshots of chatting and call details between Judge Bikramdeep Singh and deceased's son Angadpal Singh have been annexed by the father of Judge Bikramdeep Singh]. After perusal of the documents, it is found that the time when Bikramdeep Singh, Amarjot Kaur alias Pinki and one another person were seen going in and out of the house of the deceased with articles in the bag in the CCTV footage and the said footage was taken into possession by the police as proof.

After careful perusal of the footage and after considering the contents of application of Naginderjit Singh, it has been concluded by the police in the present second cancellation report that in the footage, Judge Bikramdeep Singh was seen talking with someone on mobile phone, saying "*Angad, hold for a minute*". Thus, it is clear that when CCTV footage was made, at that time, the respondent party (Bikramdeep Singh) and son of deceased judge namely Angadpal Singh were talking to each other on mobile phone. During investigation, Angadpal Singh and Arjunpal Singh, sons of the deceased judge, had sent their certified affidavit through e-mail stating that all the articles which were taken away in suitcases and bags by Bikramdeep Singh after death of Late Kanwaljeet Singh, the then Learned Additional District Judge, Sangrur (friend of complainant Dr. Bhupinder Singh) have been received by Angadpal Singh and Arjunpal Singh, sons of Late Kanwaljit Singh Additional District Judge (Sangrur). This fact has been verified/confirmed by the complainant and the sons of Late Kanwaljit Singh Additional District Judge (Sangrur) through e-mail. It is further stated in the cancellation report that on the basis of the affidavits, no concrete/cogent evidence has come on record. The presentation of challan in present case would be sheer

wastage of Court time. So, cancellation report is being presented in the Court and the same may kindly be accepted.

I have carefully perused and considered the entire record, including the cancellation report, statement of the complainant, and the material collected during investigation.

Before proceeding further, it is apposite to mention here that vide order dated 29.04.2026 passed by this Court, the cancellation report bearing no. CAN/112/2026 filed by the police was rejected and was returned back to the concerned SHO with a direction to conduct further investigation as per law and to submit a fresh report after further investigation.

Now, again present cancellation report has been filed by the police, perusal of which reveals that the Investigating Agency has relied mainly upon:-

- (i) an application submitted by Naginderjit Singh, father of accused Bikramdeep Singh,
- (ii) screenshots of WhatsApp conversation allegedly showing that accused Bikramdeep Singh was speaking to Angadpal Singh while removing articles from the house, and
- (iii) affidavits allegedly sent through e-mail by Angadpal Singh and Arjanpal Singh stating that the articles removed from the house were subsequently received by them.

However, even after further investigation, the material placed on record does not satisfactorily answer the deficiencies pointed out by this Court vide order dated 29.04.2026.

Firstly, the Investigating Officer has still failed to conduct any independent investigation regarding the articles carried in the bags as seen in the CCTV footage. Although reliance has been placed upon affidavits allegedly sent by the sons of the deceased, there is no investigation showing what articles were actually removed from the house, what articles were subsequently handed over, on which date they were handed over, at which place, by whom, and whether any inventory or seizure/release memo was prepared. The investigation still remains silent regarding identification of the articles carried in the bags as reflected in the CCTV footage.

Secondly, the entire fresh investigation appears to have been dependent on the application submitted by the father of accused Bikramdeep Singh which, by itself, cannot be sufficient to accept the cancellation report. The Investigating Officer was required to independently verify the facts stated therein instead of merely relying on the contents of the application.

Thirdly, the complainant in the present case is merely the Special Power of Attorney holder of the sons of the deceased and is not the actual aggrieved person. In the earlier order, this Court had specifically observed that the statements of the sons of the deceased were required to be recorded, preferably before the Court or through video conferencing, so as to verify the assertions forming the basis of the cancellation. However, the present cancellation report continues to rely only upon alleged affidavits stated to have been sent through e-mail. Although it is mentioned

that certified affidavits were received from the sons of the deceased, neither the deponents have been produced before this Court nor does the investigating officer disclose any reason as to why their statements could not be recorded. Mere reliance upon affidavits transmitted through e-mail cannot, in the facts and circumstances of the present case, be regarded as a substitute for recording the statements of the actual legal heirs, particularly when they alone are competent to clarify whether any theft had in fact taken place, whether the articles allegedly removed from the house were subsequently received by them, and whether they had authorized any person to remove the said articles. Consequently, the material placed on record remains insufficient to dispel the doubts noticed by this Court.

Fourthly, with regard to version that accused Bikramdeep Singh was allegedly talking to Angadpal Singh on mobile phone while removing articles from the house, the Investigating Officer was required to verify the contents of the conversation, obtain the relevant call records, record the statement of Angadpal Singh regarding the alleged authorization or consent, and correlate the same with the articles actually removed from the premises. Nothing as such was done by the Investigating Officer.

Further, there is no explanation regarding the role of accused Amarjot Kaur alias Pinki and Gaurav Goel, who are also seen entering the premises in the CCTV footage. The cancellation report is silent regarding the necessity of their presence and their specific role in removing the articles.

The subsequent statement of complainant Dr. Bhupinder Singh Virk expressing no objection to acceptance of the cancellation report also cannot be made

basis, as he admittedly acted only as Special Power of Attorney holder of the sons of the deceased. The offences alleged under Sections 331(4) and 305 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 are non-compoundable in nature and cannot be permitted to be closed merely because the complainant no longer wishes to pursue the matter.

The law is well settled that while considering a cancellation report, the Court is required to independently apply its judicial mind to the material collected during investigation and is not bound by the opinion of the Investigating Officer. In the case of **“Jitender Vs. State of Haryana, (Punjab and Haryana) 2025(4) RCR(Criminal) 767”** the Hon’ble Punjab and Haryana High Court has held that **the Trial Court must apply its mind independently to all the evidence collected during investigation including statements of witnesses and the said report (cancellation report) cannot be accepted ipso facto.**

The present case relates to allegations of house trespass and removal of valuables from the residence of a deceased Judicial Officer immediately after his death. Such allegations require a thorough, impartial and complete investigation. The present investigation still leaves several material questions unanswered and, therefore, cannot form the basis for acceptance of the cancellation report.

Accordingly, **the present cancellation report is again rejected and is returned back to the concerned SHO with the following directions for further investigation:-**

- i) To ascertain and specifically identify the articles carried away in the bags as reflected in the CCTV footage.

- ii) To prepare a complete inventory of such articles and correlate the same with the articles allegedly delivered to the legal heirs i.e. sons of the deceased.
- iii) To investigate and mention the exact date, place and manner in which each article was handed over to the sons of the deceased and to collect supporting documentary evidence, including acknowledgment or receipt, if any.
- iv) To verify the alleged telephonic conversation between accused Bikramdeep Singh and Angadpal Singh by collecting the relevant call detail records, electronic records and, if available, the recording, transcript etc. relating to such conversation.
- v) To ascertain whether any authorization or consent was in fact given by Angadpal Singh or any other legal heir for removal of the articles from the house by recording the statements of Angadpal Singh and Arjanpal Singh in accordance with law, either in person or through video conferencing.
- vi) To investigate the individual role of each person seen entering and exiting the house in the CCTV footage, including Amarjot Kaur alias Pinki, Gaurav Goel and Bikramdeep Singh.
- vii) To place on record all electronic evidence relied upon, including the alleged e-mail affidavits, screenshots and other supporting material.

The Investigating Officer shall conduct further investigation strictly in accordance with law and submit a fresh report after complying with the above directions.

Copy of this order as well as copy of order dated 29.04.2026 passed by this Court be sent to the Senior Superintendent of Police, Patiala for compliance.

Judicial Papers be separated. Remaining papers be sent to concerned SHO for necessary compliance.

Judicial papers be consigned to Judicial Record Room, Patiala after due compliance.

**Pronounced in the open Court :
10.07.2026**
Aman (Directly dictated)

**Prabha Prashar, PCS
Judicial Magistrate, Ist Class,
Patiala (UID No. PB0500)**