

CRM-M-38861-2014 (O&M)

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

Decided on: January 6, 2015.

(1) CRM-M-38861-2014 (O&M).

Arvind Kumar

..... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent(s)

*** * ***

(2) CRM-M-38889-2014 (O&M).

Neeraj Verma

..... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent(s)

*** * ***

(3) CRM-M-41013-2014 (O&M).

Amrinder Singh

..... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent(s)

*** * ***

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.M.S. BEDI

**PRESENT Mr.K.S.Kang, Advocate,
for the petitioner in CRM-M-38861-2014 and
CRM-M-38889-2014.**

**Mr.A.K.Bura, Advocate,
for the petitioner in CRM-M-41013-2014.**

Mr.C.S.Brar, DAG., Punjab.

CRM-M-38861-2014 (O&M)

M.M.S. BEDI, J (ORAL)

This order will dispose of the above noted three petitions for the grant of pre-arrest bail i.e., CRM-M-38861-2014 filed by Arvind Kumar, CRM-M-38889-2014 filed by Neeraj Verma and CRM-M-41013-2014 filed by Amrinder Singh in a case registered at the instance of Davinder Singh alleging that the petitioners connived with each other to dupe the complainant with a promise that they were involved in real estate trading and multi level marketing and investment firm and persuaded the complainant to part with huge sum of money on different occasions. Though cheques of amount of profits to the tune of Rs.6000/- and Rs.8000/- were paid on one or two occasions but later on the whereabouts of the Company or the persons running the same ceased to exist.

Counsel for the petitioners have vehemently contended that it was Jatinder Singh who was the owner of the Finance Company. The money was actually paid to him by the complainant.

Counsel for the petitioners Arvind Kumar and Neeraj Verma has submitted that as a matter of fact the petitioners have also been duped as they were made to deposit the money with the complainant with a false promise and allurements that profits will accrue from the money invested and that the deposit can be taken back after 24 months.

Davinder Singh had paid a sum of Rs.3 lacs,

CRM-M-38861-2014 (O&M)

Rs.2.87 lacs and Rs.2 lacs to the petitioners on different occasions. Similarly, the other complainant Nirmal Singh was duped of a sum of Rs.1,08,000/-. No doubt the petitioners have joined investigation. It appears to be a case not only of civil liability but also a case of criminal liability where the complainants have been persuaded to part money with a promise of higher returns.

I have also considered the contentions of the learned counsel for the petitioners that the petitioners have also been duped. It will always be open to the petitioners to initiate civil and criminal action against the persons who have cheated them.

No extra ordinary exceptional circumstances exist to grant the concession of pre-arrest bail to the petitioners.

All the three petitions are dismissed.

Nothing mentioned in this order will prejudice the rights of the petitioners to approach this Court again in case the matter is amicably resolved between the parties.

January 6, 2015.
rka

(M.M.S. BEDI)
JUDGE