

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

CRM-M-5547-2018

Date of Decision:24.04.2018

Sudarshan Kaur Grewal

.....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Mr.Atul Lakhanpal, Senior Advocate with
Mr.Arjun Lakhanpal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. J.S.Walia, Senior Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

Mr.P.S.Ahluwalia, Advocate,
for the complainant.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (Oral)

Learned counsel for the complainant has pointed out that there are three other FIRs registered against the petitioner and her son (her co-accused) with allegations of different kinds of cheating has been indulged in, and CRM-M-23712-2017 also has been filed by her projecting herself to be the wife of one Bachan Singh, who as per paragraph 2 of the said petition, “died in harness in the year 1991 while posted as District and Sessions Judge, Sangrur”, though as per the notification dated July 11, 1978, he was dismissed from service, i.e. the PCS (Judicial Branch).

Mr.Lakhanpal, learned senior counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner infact is a victim at the hands of the complainant, who allegedly has even taken away her/her sons' Fortuner Car and Honda Accord car, and has also transferred her flat to

his name, in respect of which she is stated to have filed CRM-M-13967-2017.

Prima facie atleast it would seem that the said petition has been filed alleging therein sequence of events starting from January, 2016, when a friend of the complainant in the present petition, i.e., one Karanjot Singh (the complainant being Hari Singh), had given her son a loan of Rs.5 Lakhs, but the occurrence in question in the present petition as is the subject matter of FIR no.98 dated 09.10.2017, has its origins in the year 2015, when the petitioner and her son are alleged to have promised jobs in the High Court for the complainants' son, as also to 11 other persons (as per learned counsel for the complainant), and even certain communications are stated to have been received by "the prospective candidates", allegedly issued by the Registrar of this Court.

X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X

After noticing the aforesaid this Court had actually ordered this petition to be dismissed. However, even before the draft had been put up, looking at the age and gender of the petitioner, who is stated to be a 74 year old lady, I do not think it was an appropriate order to be passed as regards bail to her, with however no comment made with regard to any of her co-accused.

Consequently, all learned counsel were asked to come to Court.

Having considered the age of the petitioner, and only and solely on account of her age and gender, as noticed herein above, I consider it appropriate to allow this petition and admit her to bail during

the pendency of the trial, upon her furnishing adequate bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

Disposed of.

April 24, 2018

dharamvir

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : YES/NO
Whether Reportable : YES/NO