

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT 201
CHANDIGARH**

(I) **CRM No.M-33622 of 2016 (O&M)**
Date of decision: December 1, 2016

Raminder Deep Kaur

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

AND

(II) **CRM No.M-39219 of 2016 (O&M)**
Date of decision: December 1, 2016

Baba Balwinder Kumar

..Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr. Narender Singh Gill, Advocate
for the petitioner (in CRM No.M-33622 of 2016)

Mr. Sanjeev Duggal, Advocate
for the petitioner (in CRM No.M-39219 of 2016)

Mr. Amit Dhawan, Advocate for the complainant.

Mr. P.S. Grewal, DAG, Punjab.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

Both the petitions are taken up together being arisen from the
same FIR.

Petitioners-Raminder Deep Kaur and Baba Balwinder Kumar
have filed these petitions under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory
bail in case FIR No.23 dated 08.03.2016, registered at Police Station
Adampur, District Jalandhar, under Sections 420 and 120-B of Indian Penal

(I) CRM No.M-33622 of 2016 (O&M) and
(II) CRM No.M-39219 of 2016 (O&M)

-2-

Notice of motion was issued in these cases.

Mr. P.S.Grewal, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab, has put in appearance on behalf of the respondent-State in both the cases and contested these petitions.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioners as well as learned State counsel and have gone through the record.

From the record, I find that the allegations against the petitioners are that they cheated the complainant on the pretext of sending them abroad. The deal was finalized for Rs.7 lakhs for sending Vipin to England and Rs.20 lakhs for sending Paramjit Kaur to Canada. As per the FIR, an amount of Rs.18 lakhs has already been paid to them. Learned counsel for the complainant stated that earlier Raminder Deep Kaur gave a cheque, which was dishonoured, then she along with Balwinder Kumar entered into a writing to pay Rs.14,70,000/-. He further submitted that an amount of Rs.2,94,000/- was also transferred in the account of the complainant, but the remaining amount has not been paid till date and the complainant has been cheated.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case; without discussing the facts of the case in minute details and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, I do not find any merit in these petitions, where the petitioners are entitled for anticipatory bail.

Accordingly, both the petitions are dismissed.

December 1, 2016

rajesh.k.khurana

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

:

Yes

Whether Reportable

:

No