

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND  
HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.40497 of 2020(O&M)

Date of Decision:28.01.2022

(Heard through VC)

Parminder Singh Shergill

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CRM-M No.739 of 2021(O&M)

Date of Decision:28.01.2022

(Heard through VC)

Rajinder Kaur

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CRM-M No.10930 of 2021(O&M)

Date of Decision:28.01.2022

(Heard through VC)

Dr. Paramjit Singh Shergill

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR**

Present:- Mr. Suvir Sidhu, Advocate  
for the petitioners in all cases.

Ms. Gunkirat Kaur, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. R.S. Bajaj, Advocate  
for the complainant.

\*\*\*\*

**JAISHREE THAKUR, J. (ORAL)**

**CRM No.1009 of 2021 in**  
**CRM-M-739 of 2021**

Application is allowed.

Annexures P-13 to P-15 are taken on record.

**CRM-M No.40497 of 2020**

This is a petition that has been filed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in FIR No.178 dated 26.09.2020 registered under Sections 406, 420, 120-B of the IPC at Police Station Navi Bardari, District Jalandhar.

Counsel for the petitioners would contend that the petitioners had joined investigation in the preliminary enquiry held and thereafter an FIR came to be registered against them. During the pendency of proceedings in the High Court, arrest of the petitioners had been stayed. It is submitted that as per the short reply filed by way of affidavit of Balwinder Iqbal Singh, Asstt. Commissioner of Police, Special Branch, Jalandhar, the matter stands investigated by the police and a cancellation report has been prepared, which will be presented in the Court. As the matter stands investigated, the custodial interrogation of the petitioners herein would no longer be required.

Learned counsel for the respondent-State relies upon the reply filed and submits that a cancellation report had been prepared and presented in Court. However, same has not been accepted as on date, as the complainant is not coming forth.

Mr. R.S. Bajaj, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of the complainant and would oppose grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have also perused the reply filed by the respondent-State in which a stand has been taken that the matter stands investigated and a cancellation report has been presented.

In view of the foregoing facts and circumstances, the custodial interrogation of the petitioners herein would not be required.

Consequently, these petitions are allowed confirming the interim order dated 22.01.2021.

The amount of Rs.10 lakhs which stands deposited pursuant to order dated 22.01.2021 with this Court will be released once the cancellation report is accepted. Petitioners are at liberty to move an appropriate application for release of the same.

January 28, 2022  
P.Bhatt

(JAISHREE THAKUR)  
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No