

- 110/4 1) CRM-M no.37897 of 2019
Gurinder Singh @ Guri v. State of Punjab
- 2) CRM-M-17307 of 2019
Satnam Singh v. State of Punjab
- 3) CRM-M no.26120 of 2019
Ramaljit Kaur v. State of Punjab
- 4) CRM-M-26627 of 2019
Kulwinder Kaur v. State of Punjab

Present: Mr. Vaibhav Sehgal, Advocate for
Mr. L.S. Mann, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. APS Gill, DAG, Punjab
Mr. Balwinder Singh Jolly, Advocate, for the complainant.

CRM-M no.37897 of 2019

The case file of CRM-M-17307 of 2019 having been called for, it is seen that an affidavit of Ms. Gurpreet Deo, IPS, Additional Director General of Police, Crime, Bureau of Investigation, Punjab, dated 03.09.2019, is on record in that case, giving therein the details of investigation carried out in connection with FIR no.130 dated 11.08.2017, FIR no.13 dated 19.01.2018 and FIR no.122 dated 17.05.2019, the last two having been registered at Police Station Sirhind and the first registered at Police Station Sarabha Nagar, Ludhiana, the last FIR being the one in the context of which the petitioner, Gurinder Singh @ Guri, seeks the concession of anticipatory bail.

A perusal of that affidavit further shows that as regards FIR no.130, dated 11.08.2017, though even a '*challan*' is stated to have been presented in that case, yet it has been found there was shoddy investigation conducted by the SHO, without verifying any facts properly, and that as a matter of fact, even the complainant in the said FIR (stated to be one

Rajinder Kaur wife of Ranjit Singh), was not found at the address given by her.

As regards Ranjit Singh, it is stated that he has been declared to be a proclaimed offender, though as per his brother, it is he (his brother), who is Ranjit Singh and that Manjit Singh is the man who actually is involved in various nefarious activities, consequent upon which he is stated to have been disowned by his father, with him often using the name of Ranjit Singh.

As regards the case in which the present petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail, as per investigation conducted so far, there was evidence shown that Rs.15 lacs had been paid to the accused, with some amounts paid even by way of RTGS transactions.

That being so, at least as regards the petitioner in CRM-M-no.37897 of 2019, i.e. Gurinder Singh @ Guri, I do not consider it an appropriate case at all to grant him the concession of anticipatory bail.

Consequently, CRM-M-37897 of 2019 is dismissed.

It is to be noticed that though it is seen that a co-accused, Satnam Singh, was admitted to interim bail, he was granted such concession of bail by this Court (coordinate Bench) vide an order dated 12.07.2019, on account of the fact that he had spent more than 4 months in custody and was 60 years of age.

CRM-M-17307 of 2019

This petition has in fact been filed by the aforesaid Satnam

Singh (father of Gurinder Singh). Though otherwise the allegation against Satnam Singh is also of the same nature as that against Gurinder Singh, however, first, a perusal of the FIR shows that the major allegations are against Gurinder Singh, and second, the petition of Gurinder Singh as has been dismissed (CRM-M-37897 of 2019), being one seeking the concession of anticipatory bail, and the present one being one seeking admission to bail after arrest, therefore, without making any comment on the actual merits of the case, for or against Satnam Singh, considering also that he is shown to be about 60 years of age, the order passed on 12.07.2019, admitting him to interim bail, is made absolute on the same terms and conditions.

CRM-M no.26120 of 2019
CRM-M-26627 of 2019

As regards the petitioners in these two petitions, i.e. Ramaljit Kaur and Kulwinder Kaur, though learned counsel for the complainant submits that even some money had been deposited in the account of Ramaljit Kaur, i.e. the mother of Gurinder Singh, nothing is on record, so far, to that effect.

Consequently, adjourned to 05.11.2019.

Both the petitioners are directed to join investigation immediately, and in case they are sought to be arrested, they would be admitted to interim bail on their furnishing adequate bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the arresting officer/Illaq Magistrate. They shall abide by the conditions stipulated in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

If the arresting officer does not join the petitioner in

investigation, she would appear before the learned Illaqa Magistrate immediately, who would then summon the arresting officer and direct him to join them in investigation.

In the meanwhile, if any transaction is found to have been conducted by payment of money to either of these two petitioners, or they are found to be involved in the commission of the crime in any manner, by the investigating agency, documents to that effect shall be placed on record in court.

A copy of this order be placed on the file of the other connected matters too.

27.09.2019
vcgarg

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
(JUDGE)