

206
IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

SANJIV KUMAR SHARMA
10/1/2019 16:36
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document

CRM-M-61603-2018 (O/M)
Date of decision : 14.1.2019

Jeewan Kumar and another

..... Petitioner (s)

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent (s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. G.S. Sandhu, Advocate,
for petitioners.

Mr. Karanbir Singh, AAG Punjab,
assisted by ASI Avtar Singh.

Mr. B.S. Jaswal, Advocate,
for complainants.

-.-

-.-

KULDIP SINGH, J. (ORAL)

Heard.

It is stated that in the year 2015, Jeewan Kumar and Gurbhej Singh (present petitioners) reached the house of complainant Mool Chand, saying that they can get his son Summit Kaushal appointed as a Sub Inspector in Punjab Police. They demanded Rs. 25,00,000/- from him. However, deal was struck at Rs. 22,00,000/-. They also claimed that their relative Francis Chaudhary alias Mithu Chaudhary is having connections with higher officials of Punjab Police. Rs. 22,00,000/- were given to accused Gurbhej Singh and Baljeet Singh and Rs. 1,50,000/- were given to accused Sukhdev Singh, who claimed himself to be Reader of IG at Chandigarh. Rs. 50,000/- were given to Francis Chaudhary. It is further stated that interview was conducted wherein all accused remained present. Even in medical test, all accused were present and they assured that appointment letter will be issued to him. Since letter of appointment to son

of complainant as sub inspector was not issued, therefore, complainant demanded back money in December, 2015. In pursuance to demand of petitioner, Gurbhej Singh gave him two cheques, first cheque for Rs. 10,00,000/- and another cheque for Rs. 5,00,000/- from his account and promised to pay balance amount. However, cheques are stated to be dishonoured. It is claimed that all accused including present petitioners have cheated complainant.

The learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Avtar Singh, states that a loan agreement was executed between parties to return said amount. Present petitioners are signatories to said agreement.

The learned counsel for petitioners however states that brother of complainant had entered into agreement with accused and that money is related to that agreement. However, allegations made in petition are very serious in nature. Police needs thorough investigation, for which free hand is to be given to police. There is no ground to grant anticipatory bail to petitioners. Petitions is dismissed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

14.1.2019
sjks

Whether speaking order : Yes / No

Whether reportable : Yes / No