

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

.....

Criminal Misc. No.M-19310 of 2018

.....

Date of decision:13.9.2018

Parminder Kaur

...Petitioner

v.

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

....

Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Inderjit Singh

.....

Present: Mr. Brijeshwar Singh Bhalla, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Monika Jalota, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab for the respondent-State.

Mr. Vikrant Duggal, Advocate for respondent No.2.

.....

Inderjit Singh, J.

The petitioner has filed this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.108 dated 1.8.2017 registered for the offences under Sections 406, 420 and 120-B IPC at Police Station Mataur, District S.A.S. Nagar (Mohali).

Notice of motion has been issued in this case.

Ms. Monika Jalota, learned Deputy Advocate General, Punjab has appeared on behalf of the respondent-State and Mr. Vikrant Duggal, learned Advocate has appeared on behalf of the complainant-respondent No.2 and contested this petition.

[2]

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

From the record, I find that the FIR has been registered on the statement of Ajit Singh, who stated that he had booked 200 sq. yards plot with the Skyrock City Welfare Society (hereinafter referred to as 'the Society') and already deposited ₹24,70,000/- till 27.4.2015. As per the allegations, the plot has not been allotted so far and he has been cheated of above amount. The present petitioner is stated to be General Secretary of the Society and has been named in the FIR and serious allegations have been levelled against her. As per the allegations in the FIR, Navjeet Singh co-accused and the present petitioner have taken money on the pretext of selling plots from so many persons, but have not allotted the plots etc. As argued, there are so many FIRs registered against the present petitioner.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, without giving the facts in minute detail and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, I find that the petitioner is required for custodial interrogation.

Therefore, finding no merit in this petition, the same is dismissed.

September 13, 2018.

(Inderjit Singh)
Judge

hsp

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