

**CRM-M-21752-2017 and
CRM-M-22408-2017**

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

Date of Decision:27.07.2017

1. CRM-M-21752-2017

Harbans Singh and another

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

AND

2. CRM-M-22408-2017

Amandeep Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr. Naresh Kaushik, Advocate,
for the petitioners in both the petitions.

Mr. Gaurav Garg Dhuriwala, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Mr. R.S.Bajaj, Advocate,
for the complainant.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

This order shall dispose of CRM-M-21752-2017, filed by
petitioners-Harbans Singh and Mahinder Kaur and CRM-M-22408-2017,
filed by petitioner-Amandeep Singh, under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of
anticipatory bail in case FIR No.128 dated 19.05.2017, registered at Police

**CRM-M-21752-2017 and
CRM-M-22408-2017**

Station Sultanpur Lodhi, District Kapurthala, under Sections 498-A and 406 of the Indian Penal Code.

Notice of motion was issued in both these petitions. Learned State counsel put in appearance on behalf of the respondent-State and complainant also appeared through her counsel.

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

In pursuance of the order dated 21.06.2017 passed by this Court in CRM-M-22408-2017, a demand draft of Rs.20,000/- has been handed over to learned counsel for complainant.

At the time of arguments, it is admitted by learned counsel for the petitioners that anticipatory bail applications filed by the present petitioners are pending before the Court of Session and during the pendency of said bail applications before the Court of Session, the present petitions have been filed before this Court. When anticipatory bail applications have not been decided by the Court of Session and are pending there, the petitioners cannot avail the same remedy before two courts at the same time. The conduct of the petitioners, itself, debars them from any relief.

Keeping in view the above facts and without discussing the merits of the case, the present petitions are dismissed.

27.07.2017
parveen kumar

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

Note:	Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes
	Whether reportable	:	No