

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

203

CRM-M-31942-2016 (O&M).  
Decided on: November 21, 2016.

Ramesh Kumar

.. Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Haryana

.. Respondent(s)

\* \* \*

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

\* \* \*

PRESENT Mr.Jitender Dhanda, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

Mr.C.S.Bakshi, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

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

On the instructions of ASI Satish Kumar, it has been informed by the State counsel that the petitioner has joined investigation.

Taking into consideration the fact the petitioner has been involved in the case on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused Anil Kumar, this petition is allowed. Interim order dated 9.9.2016, is hereby made absolute. It is ordered that in case of arrest of the petitioner, he shall be released on bail to the satisfaction of the arresting officer subject to the conditions that the petitioner will join investigation as and when required and will not indulge in similar activity akin to present criminal case.

(M.M.S. BEDI)  
JUDGE

November 21, 2016.

rka

Whether speaking / reasoned  
Whether reportable:

Yes / No  
Yes / No

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

233

CRM-M-35162-2016 (O&M).  
Decided on: November 21, 2016.

**Kulveer Kaur and another**

**.. Petitioner(s)**

**VERSUS**

**State of Punjab and others**

**.. Respondent(s)**

\* \* \*

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

\* \* \*

**PRESENT None for the petitioners.**

**Ms.Simsi Dhir Malhotra, DAG., Punjab.**

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

Despite service no one has put in appearance on behalf of the private respondents implying thereby that there is no threat to the life and liberty of the petitioners.

In view of above, the petition is allowed. Interim order dated 30.9.2016, is hereby made absolute.

**(M.M.S. BEDI)  
JUDGE**

**November 21, 2016.**

**rka**

Whether speaking / reasoned  
Whether reportable:

Yes / No  
Yes / No

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

232

CRM-M-35123-2016 (O&M).  
Decided on: November 21, 2016.

**Ramanjit Kaur and another**

**.. Petitioner(s)**

**VERSUS**

**State of Punjab and others**

**.. Respondent(s)**

\* \* \*

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

\* \* \*

**PRESENT None for the petitioners.**

**Ms.Simsi Dhir Malhotra, DAG., Punjab.**

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

State counsel, on the instructions of ASI Narinder Singh, informs that statements of the petitioners have been recorded to the effect that there is no threat to their life and liberty.

In view of above, the petition is allowed. Interim order dated 30.9.2016, is hereby made absolute.

**(M.M.S. BEDI)  
JUDGE**

**November 21, 2016.**

**rka**

Whether speaking / reasoned  
Whether reportable:

Yes / No  
Yes / No

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

230

CRM-M-31797-2016 (O&M).  
Decided on: November 21, 2016.

Anju Rani and another

.. Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Punjab and others

.. Respondent(s)

\* \* \*

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

\* \* \*

PRESENT None for the petitioners.

Ms.Simsi Dhir Malhotra, DAG., Punjab.

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

Despite service of the private respondents, no one is present to contest the petition implying thereby that there is no threat to the life and liberty of the petitioners.

State counsel also, on the instructions of HC Kulwant Singh, informs that statements of the petitioners have been recorded to the effect that there is no threat to their life and liberty.

In view of above, the petition is allowed. Interim order dated 9.9.2016, is hereby made absolute.

(M.M.S. BEDI)  
JUDGE

November 21, 2016.  
rka

Whether speaking / reasoned  
Whether reportable:

Yes / No  
Yes / No

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

229

CRM-M-31723-2016 (O&M).  
Decided on: November 21, 2016.

Arjinder Kaur and another

.. Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Punjab and others

.. Respondent(s)

\* \* \*

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

\* \* \*

PRESENT None for the petitioners.

Ms.Simsi Dhir Malhotra, DAG., Punjab.

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

State counsel, on the instructions of SI Nachhatar Singh, informs that statements of the petitioners have been recorded to the effect that there is no threat to their life and liberty. However, an application under Section 340 Cr.P.C. has been filed for launching prosecution by the private respondents claiming that false statement of fact has been made in the present petition.

Since there is no threat to the life and liberty of the petitioners, without entering into the controversy regarding the age of the petitioners, this petition is disposed of confirming the order dated 8.9.2016.

(M.M.S. BEDI)  
JUDGE

November 21, 2016.  
rka

Whether speaking / reasoned  
Whether reportable:

Yes / No  
Yes / No

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

228

CRM-M-31723-2016 (O&M).  
Decided on: November 21, 2016.

Marjeena and another

.. Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Punjab and others

.. Respondent(s)

\* \* \*

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

\* \* \*

PRESENT None for the petitioners.

Ms.Simsi Dhir Malhotra, DAG., Punjab.

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

State counsel, on the instructions of HC Balbir Singh, informs that statements of the petitioners have been recorded to the effect that there is no threat to their life and liberty.

In view of above, the petition is allowed. Interim order dated 8.9.2016, is hereby made absolute.

(M.M.S. BEDI)  
JUDGE

November 21, 2016.

rka

Whether speaking / reasoned  
Whether reportable:

Yes / No  
Yes / No

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

227

CRM-M-31173-2016 (O&M).  
Decided on: November 21, 2016.

Manisha and another

.. Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Haryana and others

.. Respondent(s)

\* \* \*

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

\* \* \*

PRESENT None for the petitioners.

Mr.C.S.Bakshi, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

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

On account of process fee having not been filed, notices could not be issued. It appears that there is not threat to the life and liberty of the petitioners.

This petition is dismissed for non-filing of process fee.

(M.M.S. BEDI)  
JUDGE

November 21, 2016.

rka

Whether speaking / reasoned  
Whether reportable:

Yes / No  
Yes / No

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

117

CRM-M-41667-2016 (O&M).  
Decided on: November 21, 2016.

Renu and another

.. Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of U.T., Chandigarh and others

.. Respondent(s)

\* \* \*

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

\* \* \*

PRESENT Mr.Maninderjit Singh, Advocate,  
for the petitioners.

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

Counsel for the petitioners seeks permission to withdraw  
the present petition, at this stage.

Dismissed as withdrawn, at this stage.

(M.M.S. BEDI)  
JUDGE

November 21, 2016.

rka

Whether speaking / reasoned  
Whether reportable:

Yes / No  
Yes / No

**121 CRM-M-41295-2016**  
**BIR SINGH VS PHOOL KUMAR AND ORS**

**PRESENT            None for the petitioner.**

Application for summoning additional accused under Section 319 Cr.P.C. has been dismissed by the trial Court as well as by the revisional Court.

No one is present on behalf of the petitioner.

Adjourned to 8.12.2016.

**(M.M.S. BEDI)**  
**JUDGE**

**November 21, 2016.**  
**rka**

**123 CRM-M-41465-2016**  
**MADHU SHANKAR VS STATE OF PUNJAB & ANR**

**PRESENT        Mr.Anupam Bhardwaj, Advocate,**  
**for the petitioner.**

Counsel for the petitioner submits that challan has already been presented and that the complainant has also filed a suit for recovery of a sum of Rs.70,000/-.

In view of said circumstances, the continuation of proceedings against the petitioner appear to be an abuse of process of law.

Notice of motion for 24.1.2017.

Meanwhile, further proceedings against the petitioner will remain stayed.

**(M.M.S. BEDI)**  
**JUDGE**

**November 21, 2016.**  
**rka**

**130 CRM-M-41682-2016**  
**TARSEM SINGH VS STATE OF PUNJAB**

**PRESENT            Mr.Deepak Bhardwaj, Advocate,**  
**for the petitioner.**

Petitioner has been summoned as accused in a private complaint filed on the allegations that he was found in possession of allopathy medicines and that he was not authorised to prescribe or possess the same.

Counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner being a Registered Medical Practitioner with Rajkiya Ayurvedic and Unani Chikitsa Parishad, Bihar and having done Vaid Visharad is entitled to practice allopathy.

Notice of motion for 22.12.2016.

On asking of the Court, notice has been accepted by Ms.Simsi Dhir Malhotra, DAG., Punjab, present in the Court. Copy given.

Meanwhile, the proceedings before the trial Court will be subject to the decision of this case.

**(M.M.S. BEDI)**  
**JUDGE**

**November 21, 2016.**  
**rka**

**132 CRM-M-41729-2016**  
**SHANU @ HEENA KHAN VS STATE OF HARYANA AND**  
**ANOTHER**

**PRESENT        Mr.Sanjiv Kumar, Advocate,**  
**for the petitioner.**

Adjourned to 12.12.2016.

Counsel for the petitioner will make available copy of the  
complaint by next date of hearing in vernacular.

**(M.M.S. BEDI)**  
**JUDGE**

**November 21, 2016.**  
**rka**

**245 CRM-M-39908-2016**  
**SOHNI AND ANOTHER VS STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS**

Report along with file put up by the office perused.

Necessary correction in the number of the case is made.

Number is corrected from 39907 to 39908.

**(M.M.S. BEDI)**  
**JUDGE**

**November 21, 2016.**  
**rka**

**201 CRM-M-18411-2016**  
**AMANDEEP SINGH BEDI VS STATE OF HARYANA**

**PRESENT            Mr.Manish Soni, Advocate,**  
**for the petitioner.**

**Mr.C.S.Bakshi, Addl. A.G., Haryana.**

**Mr.Sarju Puri, Advocate, for the complainant.**

Counsel for the complainant as well as the State counsel have brought to the notice of this Court the fact that the same property has been agreed to be sold to 3-4 different peoples on receipt of earnest money and ultimately, the said property was sold to Sunil Khandelwal for a sum of Rs.3,00,69,000/-. The names of the persons with whom agreement of sale had been executed have been disclosed as Sarve Kirti Kumar Sharma, Rajesh Kumar, Ravinder Singh, Dhanwant Singh and M/s BDR Buildtech Private Limited.

Adjourned to 13.12.2016, for arguments.

Meanwhile, interim order will remain operative subject to petitioner joining investigation on 26.11.2016 and explain the circumstances for execution of different agreements of sale.

**(M.M.S. BEDI)**  
**JUDGE**

**November 21, 2016.**  
**rka**

**201 CRM-M-16318-2016**  
**RIPIKA KUMAR @ RIPIKA BEDI VS STATE OF HARYANA**

**PRESENT**

**Mr.Manish Soni, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.**

**Mr.C.S.Bakshi, Addl. A.G., Haryana.**

**Mr.Sarju Puri, Advocate, for the complainant.**

Adjourned to 13.12.2016, for arguments.

To be heard along with CRM-M-18411-2016.

Interim order in similar terms as in CRM-M-18411-2016.

**(M.M.S. BEDI)**  
**JUDGE**

**November 21, 2016.**  
**rka**

**202 CRM-M-25822-2016**  
**PAWAN KUMAR VERMA AND ORS. VS STATE OF HARYANA**

**PRESENT            Mr.Aditya Sanghi, Advocate,**  
**for the petitioners.**

**Mr.C.S.Bakshi, Addl. A.G., Haryana.**

**Mr.G.S.Gopera, Advocate,**  
**for the complainant.**

It has been informed that the petitioner has neither joined investigation nor taken any steps to repay the amount of security or otherwise. Since in a similar matter registered in Punjab, a period of one month has been granted to the petitioner to amicably resolve the dispute before adjudication of the matter on merits, in the interest of justice, I grant one month time to the petitioner to amicably settle the dispute with the complainants/aggrieved persons.

Adjourned to 23.12.2016 for a report regarding the matter having been compromised.

Interim order will remain operative subject to petitioner joining investigation on 3.12.2016 and 17.12.2016, at two places i.e. Madhuban and Gurgaon respectively, in the cases which are under investigation before the State Agency. In case the petitioner has entered into compromise with any of the aggrieved persons, the details of those compromises may be brought to the notice of the investigating agency on above said dates.

**(M.M.S. BEDI)**  
**JUDGE**

**November 21, 2016.**  
**rka**

**204 CRM-M-35034-2016**  
**MANGAL SINGH SANDHU VS STATE OF PUNJAB**

**PRESENT        Mr.S.S.Rangi, Advocate,**  
**for the petitioner.**

**Ms.Simsi Dhir Malhotra, DAG., Punjab.**

State counsel has expressed her inability to assist the Court on account of the investigating officer having not approached her. However, she states that there are serious allegations against the petitioner not warranting grant of pre-arrest bail.

Adjourned to 22.12.2016.

Meanwhile, the petitioner will remain on bail against the bail bonds already furnished.

**(M.M.S. BEDI)**  
**JUDGE**

**November 21, 2016.**  
**rka**

**205 CRM-M-39201-2016**  
**HARBANS SINGH & ANOTHER VS STATE OF PUNJAB**

**PRESENT        Mr.Manish Kumar Singla, Advocate,**  
**for the petitioners.**

**Ms.Simsi Dhir Malhotra, DAG., Punjab.**

Petitioners along with Manjit Singh co-accused are involved in a cross version which was recorded at the instance of Jagpreet Singh.

It has been informed that Manjit Singh is in custody for the alleged grievous injury caused by him on the person of Sarabjeet Singh

State counsel has opposed the application, inter alia, on the ground that Nahar Singh and Babbu Singh have received injuries grievous and dangerous to life at the hands of Jagsir Singh.

Adjourned to 15.12.2016.

A copy of the MLR of Nahar Singh be made available on next date of hearing.

Interim order to continue.

**(M.M.S. BEDI)**  
**JUDGE**

**November 21, 2016.**  
**rka**