

Court No. - 16

Case :- CRIMINAL MISC ANTICIPATORY BAIL
APPLICATION U/S 438 CR.P.C. No. - 2229 of 2023

Applicant :- Sarita Verma

Opposite Party :- State Of U.P. Thru. Prin. Secy. Home Lko.
And Others

Counsel for Applicant :- Suyash Bajpai

Counsel for Opposite Party :- G.A.

Hon'ble Subhash Vidyarthi,J.

1. Heard Sri K.M. Tripathi, the learned counsel for the applicant as well as Sri Jayant Singh Tomar, the learned AGA-I for the State and perused the records.
2. The instant application has been filed by the applicant seeking anticipatory bail in an FIR bearing Case Crime No. 86/2021, under Sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 471 IPC and 66 & 66-D of I.T. Act, Police Station Nawabganj, District Gonda.
3. The aforesaid case has been registered on the basis of an FIR lodged on 17.03.2021 against four named persons, not including the applicant and some unknown persons, alleging that the accused persons were involved in preparation of forge treasury bills and fraudulent withdrawals from government treasury.
4. In the affidavit filed in support of the application it has been contended that the applicant is innocent, she has falsely been implicated in the present case and that she has no criminal history.
5. Learned counsel for the applicant has submitted that the applicant is not named even in the charge sheet but still, the police is attempting to arrest her.
6. He has further submitted that the applicant's husband-named accused Arun Kumar Verma has been granted bail by means of an order dated 04.12.2021 passed by this Court in Bail No. 11650 of 2021.
7. The learned counsel for the applicant has submitted that all the other named accused persons have been granted bail in the present case.

8. Per contra, the learned AGA-I has vehemently opposed the anticipatory bail application and he has submitted that the applicant claims herself to be a housewife and Rs. 2,88,84,257/- were deposited in her bank accounts. He has submitted that deposit of such a huge sum in the bank accounts of a housewife, whose husband is a government employee, indicates the applicant's involvement in the commission of the offence.

9. Having considered the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, I am of the view that the applicant does not deserve to be granted discretion of this court by granting pre-arrest bail to her.

10. The anticipatory bail application is ***rejected*** accordingly. However, in case the applicant files an application for grant of bail, the same shall be considered and decided on its merits, without being influenced by any observations made in this order.

Order Date :- 12.10.2023

Pradeep/-