

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

(i) CRM No.M-467 of 2018 (O&M)

Tejwant Singh

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent

(ii) CRM No.M-5789 of 2018 (O&M)

Mukesh Kumar

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent

(iii) CRM No.M-13300 of 2018 (O&M)

Neha Kalia

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent

Date of Decision: July 19, 2018

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr.Narinder Lucky, Advocate
for the petitioner (in CRM No.M-467 of 2018)

Mr.Dilpreet Singh Gandhi, Advocate
for the petitioners (in CRM Nos.M-5789 and 13300 of 2018).

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

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

All the above-mentioned cases are taken up together as these have arisen from same FIR.

Petitioners have filed these petitions under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.48 dated 04.03.2017 under Sections 406, 420 and 120-B IPC, registered at Police Station Navi Baradari, District Jalandhar.

Notice of motion was issued. Learned State counsel appeared and contested the petitions.

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

As per allegations in the FIR, petitioners Tejwant Singh, Mukesh Kumar, Neha Kalia along with co-accused Tarandeep Kuar and Sandeep Watts, were Directors of the firm namely Fusion Infra Build India Limited and they opened a branch at Sri Muktsar Sahib under the operation of Sandeep Watts. As per the allegations in the FIR, cheating has been committed, as on the inducement of Sandeep Watts, the complainants and other persons, deposited money. The accused induced them to invest money and told them that they will get double money within six years and also for allotting the plots etc. Now, the office of firm at Sri Muktsar Sahib has been closed and nothing has been returned.

Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that money is to be returned after six years, therefore, complainants should wait. At the same time, on enquiry by the Court, learned counsel for the petitioner could not give satisfactory reply nor has produced any document on record to show

that firm has sufficient amount in the account to return the money. Rather, as per investigation, present petitioners are also absconding and have closed the operations of the firm.

Keeping in view serious allegations against the present petitioners of cheating, without discussing the facts in minute detail and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, I do not find it a fit case where petitioners are entitled to benefit of anticipatory bail.

Therefore, finding no merit in all the petitions, the same are dismissed. The orders granting interim bail to the petitioners stand vacated.

July 19, 2018
Vgulati

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes
No