

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

CRM-M No. 31951 of 2018
Date of decision : February 25, 2019

Parminder Kaur

..... Petitioner

v.

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present : Mr. Shivender, Advocate
for Mr. BS Bhalla, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Amarjit Kaur Khurana, DAG Punjab

Mr. Ajay Pal Singh Saini, Advocate
for the complainant.

Ajay Tewari, J (Oral)

The petitioner seeks grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.198, dated 23.8.2017, registered under Sections 406, 420, 120-B of the IPC and Sections 3(1), 5(1) of the Punjab Apartment and Property Regulation Act, 1995, at Police Station Sohana, SAS Nagar, Mohali.

Allegations against the petitioner were that she floated a society, took money from various people and ultimately it transpired that the entire land had already been sold and, thus, the complainants were left high and dry.

On 19.11.2018, the following order was passed :-

“ Counsel for the petitioner submits that as per

agreement, plots have already been allotted to the complainant and other members of the society i.e. Sky Rock City Welfare Society. He is directed to submit complete record with regard to delivery of possession.

Notice be also given to the complainant for ascertaining the fact whether he has been given possession of the plot or not.

List on 21.1.2019.

Interim order to continue.”

Thereafter, on 11.2.2019, the following order was passed :-

“ Complainants namely Balwinder Kaur, Lokinder Deeman, Paramjit Singh, Varinder Singh Rawat, Satanam Singh, Sunita Arora, Nishan Chand and Bhisham Attri are present in the Court and have stated that they and all members of the Sky Rock City Welfare Society want their money back.

Counsel for the petitioner seeks an adjournment to get instructions in this regard.

Adjourned to 25.2.2019.”

Today, the complainants are present in person and have asserted that all the offers made by the petitioner are false since she had already sold more land what she had in her possession. It is clear that the petitioner obtained the interim order on a false statement made on 19.11.2018. In these circumstances, I see no ground to allow the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Consequently, this petition is dismissed.

Since the main case has been decided, the pending C.Ms, if any, also stand disposed of.

(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE

February 25, 2019
`kk'

Whether speaking/reasoned:
Whether Reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No