

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

(I) CRM-M-1023-2016 (O&M)
Date of decision : 20.09.2016

Baldev Singh and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

(II) CRM-M-5388-2016 (O&M)
Date of decision : 20.09.2016

Hardeep Kaur

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

(III) CRM-M-10942-2016 (O&M)
Date of decision : 20.09.2016

Jagtar Singh

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. V.S. Rana, Advocate for the petitioners
in CRM-M Nos.1023 and 10942 of 2016.

Mr. Deepak Bhardwaj, Advocate for the petitioner
in CRM-M No.5388 of 2016.

Ms. Harsimrat Rai, DAG, Punjab,
assisted by ASI Ravinder Singh.

Mr. H.S. Jugait, Advocate for the complainant.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J. (Oral)

The petitioner has approached this Court under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (for short, 'Cr.P.C.') for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.105 dated 05.10.2015, registered under Section 420 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 24 of the Immigration Act, at Police Station Chamkaur Sahib, District Rupnagar, Punjab.

Learned counsel contend that the matter has been investigated thrice and no incriminating material was collected against the petitioners. No specific role has been ascribed to them. Petitioner Hardeep Kaur was a mother of an infant child at the time of the alleged occurrence. The petitioners have joined the investigation in terms of the orders passed by this Court.

On the other hand, on instructions, learned State counsel states that the petitioners in connivance with each other, received a sum of Rs.18.00 lacs on the assurance that the son of the complainant would be settled abroad whose whereabouts are not known till date. The bail petition of similarly placed co-accused, Kesar Singh, has already been declined by this Court. Lastly, she submits that the petitioners have though joined the investigation, but they are not cooperating and the amount is yet to be recovered.

Keeping in view the fact that the recovery of the amount is yet to be effected and the son of the complainant is still missing, this Court feels that it is a fit case for custodial interrogation of the petitioners.

In view of the above, no case for grant of bail is made out.

Dismissed.

However, nothing noticed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion of this Court, on the merits of the case.

20.09.2016
atulsethi

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking / reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No