

**In The High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana  
At Chandigarh**

**(I)** **CRM-M-46002-2018 (O&M)**  
Date of Decision:- 24.1.2019

|                 |        |                |
|-----------------|--------|----------------|
| Sohan Singh     | Versus | ... Petitioner |
| State of Punjab |        | ... Respondent |

**(II)** **CRM-M-45039-2018 (O&M)**

|                 |        |                |
|-----------------|--------|----------------|
| Puro Devi       | Versus | ... Petitioner |
| State of Punjab |        | ... Respondent |

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL**

Present:- Mr. R.S.Chauhan, Advocate, for the petitioner(s).  
Mr. Amandeep Singh Gill, Sr. DAG, Punjab.  
Ms. Meenu Salwan, Advocate, for the complainant.

\*\*\*\*\*

**GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (Oral)**

1. This order shall dispose of the above mentioned two petitions wherein petitioner Sohan Singh and Puro Devi, have approached this Court seeking grant of anticipatory bail in respect of a case registered against them vide FIR No.106, dated 24.8.2018, registered at Police

Station Division No.2, Pathankot, under Sections 420, 406 IPC and Section 76 of Chit Funds Act, 1982.

2. The FIR was registered at the instance of Reetu wherein it has been stated that the complainant had earlier moved an application to the police against both the petitioners pertaining to cheating of an amount of ₹ 4 lacs which had been got compromised vide written compromise dated 22.3.2017, as per which the accused had agreed to pay an amount of ₹ 5,000/- per month but despite the said compromise, the accused did not pay even a single penny and have rather been threatening the complainant with dire consequences.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that they have been implicated in the present case by levelling false allegations to the effect that the petitioners are running 'committees' and that alleged compromise, as referred to in the FIR, was in fact got effected under undue influence, pressure and coercion at the behest of the police officials.
4. Opposing the petition(s), learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant has submitted that in fact it is a case where the petitioners are into business of running 'committees' and during the said process they had received blank cheques from their clients participating in the 'committees' which they are not returning and have also usurped huge amount, invested by their clients participating in the 'committees'.
5. Having considered rival submissions addressed before this Court and keeping in view the fact that it is a case where the total amount

involved is stated to be ₹ 4 lacs and that the assertions of the complainant that the accused are having some of his unused cheques is debatable, in my opinion, it is a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail. The petitions, as such are accepted. In the event of arrest, the petitioners be released on bail subject to their furnishing personal bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting/Investigating Officer. The petitioners shall join the investigation as and when called upon to do so and cooperate with the Investigating Officer and shall also abide by the conditions as provided under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.

6. It is, however, clarified that none of the observations made above shall be taken to be an expression on merits of the main case.

**January 24, 2019**

mohan

**( GURVINDER SINGH GILL)  
JUDGE**

Whether speaking /reasoned

Yes / No

Whether Reportable

Yes / No