

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

Date of Decision: 31.05.2017

1. CRM-M No.8915 of 2017(O&M)

Sunil Kumar

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

2. CRM-M No.8918 of 2017(O&M)

Parminder Kaur

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM:-HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

Present:Mr. Liaqat Ali, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Shilesh Gupta, Addl, AG, Punjab.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J.(ORAL)

Vide this common order, CRM-M No.8915 of 2017 titled Sunil Kumar Vs. State of Punjab and CRM-M No.8918 of 2017 titled Parminder Kaur Vs. State of Punjab are being disposed of.

Status report by way of affidavit of Harvinder Singh, P.P.S Superintendent of Police, Sub Division Phagwara, District Kapurthala has been filed today in the Court, the same is taken

on record.

Learned counsel for the petitioners seeks to argue that in fact on 23.06.2015, there was a theft in the house of Parminder Kaur when she was away to attend some marriage. On return from the marriage on 25.06.2015, she came to know about the theft. Police was informed. Even the place of occurrence was visited by electronic media. No FIR was registered, despite representation made by Parminder Kaur.

On 08.07.2015, Parminder Kaur and Sunil Kumar went to some doctor and thereafter, they were arrested by ASI Paramjit Singh. FIR No.94 came to be registered on 09.07.2015 under Sections 22/61/85 of the NDPS Act against Parminder Kaur in Police Station Sadar Phagwara, District Kapurthala, whereas FIR No.79 was registered on 10.07.2015 for the offences under Sections 22/61/85 of the NDPS Act against Sunil Kumar in Police Station Satnampura, District Kapurthala.

Learned counsel for the petitioners vehemently contended that the aforesaid criminal cases were lodged on account of evil design of ASI Paramjit Singh who was also present at the spot on 08.07.2015.

On 10.05.2017, movement register qua ASI Paramjit Singh along with constituent members of the police parties in both the FIRs was summoned in order to see the departure and

arrival time of the police parties in the context of both the FIRs.

Today, on perusal of the movement register, it has been found that DDR Nos.16 and 18 have been recorded in respect of both the FIRs with reference to departure and arrival of the police parties. FIRs in question are based on *ruqa* having been sent by the police parties for registration of the cases.

The plea as raised by the learned counsel for the petitioners cannot be appreciated in the light of *prima facie* material on record. No ground for grant of anticipatory bail is made out.

These petitions are accordingly dismissed.

31.05.2017	(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
prince	JUDGE
Whether Reasoned/Speaking	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No