

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

CRM No.M-26652 of 2018 (O&M)

Date of Decision: August 27, 2018

Parminder Kaur

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr.B.S.Bhalla, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms.Monika Jalota, DAG, Punjab
for the respondent-State.

Mr.Rajeev Sharma and Mr.Vikrant Duggal, Advocate
for the complainants.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

Petitioner has filed this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.0005 dated 22.06.2016 under Sections 420 and 120-B IPC, registered at Police Station Punjab State Crime Home Station, SAS Nagar.

Notice of motion was issued. Learned State counsel as well as learned counsel for the complainants appeared and contested the petition.

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 FIR in the present has been registered on the basis of complaint filed by 65 persons against Sky Rock

City Welfare Society, present petitioner and her husband Navjeet Singh. As per the allegations, accused committed fraud with thousands of people and roaming around without any fear. It is also the allegation that they have opened six new companies to commit fraud activities under the shield of new companies. As per prosecution version, the accused have six acres of land in their names and they have executed agreement with other parties to purchase the land. There are 1200 applicants to whom plots/flats were to be given. Present petitioner is also Director in the company and one of the main accused. There are 26 FIRs against the present petitioner. It has also been brought to the notice of this Court that 63 FIRs have been registered against husband of the petitioner.

Keeping in view the serious allegations against the petitioner, who is named in the FIR and in view of the fraud committed with so many people by the petitioner and other co-accused, I find that petitioner is required for custodial interrogation and no ground is made out for granting benefit of anticipatory bail to her.

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

August 27, 2018
Vgulati

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes
No