

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH.**

Date of Decision:-09.02.2016

CRM-M No.33961 of 2015(O&M)

Sulakshna Goel.

.....Petitioner.

Versus

State of Punjab.

.....Respondent.

2

CRM-M No.32682 of 2015

Shikha Goel @ Shikha Garg.

.....Petitioner.

Versus

State of Punjab.

.....Respondent.

AND

CRM-M No.34032 of 2015(O&M)

Vivek Goel.

.....Petitioner.

Versus

State of Punjab.

.....Respondent.

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASWANT SINGH

Present:- None for the Petitioner in all the Petitions.

Mr. Kirat Singh Sidhu, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab
assisted by ASI Charanjit Singh.

JASWANT SINGH, J (ORAL)

By this common order I shall dispose of all the aforementioned three petitions as the same arises out of common FIR.

Prayer is under Section 438 Cr.PC for grant of regular bail to the petitioners-family members namely **Sulakshana Goel** (in CRM-M No.33961 of 2015), **Shikha Goel @ Shikha Garg** (in CRM-M No.32682 of 2015) & **Vivek Goel** (in CRM-M No.34032 of 2015) in case FIR No.64 dated 25.04.2015 for offences punishable under Sections 420, 120-B of Indian Penal Code registered with Police Station Durgi, Ludhiana, Punjab.

As per the prosecution, complainant Vikram Singh Bajwa was cheated by inducing him to furnish a guarantee for a sum of Rs.50 lacs by tendering his title deeds qua his properties for a proprietorship firm-M/s Goyal Sales Corporation by misrepresenting that the same is meant for another firm namely M/s Gee Pee Aar Rubber Mills Pvt. Ltd.

During the course of hearing on 15.10.2015, Counsel for the petitioners in the aforesaid three petitions had prayed for time with the assurance that before the next date of hearing i.e. 17.12.2015 the sureties of the complainant would be got replaced and the charges of the Punjab National Bank qua the properties of the complainant would be got released since the complainant was in receipt of a notice about under the SARFESI Act qua his mortgaged land on account of default in payment of installments.

Learned Counsel for the State as well as the complainant points out that till date the sureties have not been got replaced and, therefore, petitioners are not entitled to any further indulgence.

The aforesaid factual position is correct. No one has appeared on behalf of the petitioners to counter the said factual position.

In view of the above, no case for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner(s) in aforementioned three petitions is made out.

Dismissed.

(JASWANT SINGH)
JUDGE

February 09, 2016
Vinay