

**CRM-M-11435-2015 and
CRM-M-13334-2015**

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

Date of Decision:25.05.2015

1. CRM-M-11435-2015

Rajbir Singh and another

.... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana

.... Respondent

AND

2. CRM-M-13334-2015

Rani

.... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PARAMJEET SINGH

- 1) Whether Reporters of the local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?.
- 2) To be referred to the Reporters or not ?.
- 3) Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest ?

Present : Mr. Aman Pal, Advocate,
for the petitioners in both the petitions.

Mr. Anil Mehta, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Ashwani Gaur, Advocate,
for the complainant.

Paramjeet Singh, J. (Oral)

This order shall dispose of CRM-M-11435-2015, titled

**CRM-M-11435-2015 and
CRM-M-13334-2015**

'Rajbir Singh and another vs. State of Haryana' and CRM-M-13334-2015, titled 'Rani vs. State of Haryana', as common questions of fact and law are involved in both the petitions.

Both the petitions have been filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in case FIR No.140 dated 26.02.2015, registered at Police Station City Sonapat, District Sonapat, under Sections 406, 420, 506, 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

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

There are serious allegations against petitioner-Rani that she is virtually indulging in a chit-fund business and has been collecting money from various persons with the help of petitioners-Rajbir and Chirag.

Learned State counsel after seeking instructions from SI Kadam Singh states that amount of more than Rs.3 crores is involved in this business.

The income-tax returns of petitioners-Rajbir and Rani have also been perused. Source of income shown in the returns does not appear to be sufficient. Learned counsel for the petitioners has also annexed the lease deeds Annexures A-14 and A-15 (Colly.) to show the source of income, but the same have not been reflected in the income-tax returns of petitioner-Rani and the same have been registered on 01.05.2014 and 01.02.2015. The aforesaid documents, themselves,

**CRM-M-11435-2015 and
CRM-M-13334-2015**

appear to have been got registered subsequently as an afterthought. Keeping in view the nature of offence, the police should investigate the case with an angle whether there is a chit fund scam and proceed in accordance with law. Otherwise also, looking into other implications of such type of offence, the petitioners are not entitled for the benefit of anticipatory bail.

Dismissed.

25.05.2015
parveen kumar

(Paramjeet Singh)
Judge