



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

214

CRM-M-13904-2026

Date of Decision : 14.07.2026

MEENU PATLE

.... PETITIONER

V/S

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

.... RESPONDENTS

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESH CHANDER DIMRI

Present : Mr.Abhimanyu Choudhary, Advocate and
Mr. Vikas Bairagi, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Swati Batra, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

RAMESH CHANDER DIMRI, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner prays for grant of anticipatory bail in a case bearing FIR No.382 dated 29.09.2025, under Sections 406 and 420 IPC registered at Police Station Chandimandir, District Panchkula.

2. The allegations against the petitioner and her husband are that they have embezzled approximately Rs.83 lakhs belonging to the complainant out of which a sum of Rs.60 lakhs was taken by them on the pretext of investing the same for better profits. The prosecution, in fact, says that they had taken Rs.1 Crore from the complainant but returned Rs.17 lakhs only to her.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that contents of FIR in question are false and have been manipulated by the complainant

as per her convenience; that the petitioner has repaid a sum of Rs. 17



lakhs and sum of Rs. 60 lakhs was paid in the name of a trust; and that the petitioner is ready to join investigation and to cooperate with the investigating agency on all material counts.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel argues that money in question and at least Rs.60 lakhs were taken from the complainant on the pretext of giving higher benefits but neither the benefits were given nor the amount of Rs.60 lakhs was returned to the complainant; that as on date, an amount of Rs.83 lakhs comes out to have been embezzled by the petitioner and her husband; and that mother of the petitioner and mother of the co-accused Manish Patle (husband of the petitioner) are the trustees of the trust in whose account the above-stated amount of Rs.60 lakhs was transferred.

5. Be that as it may, without commenting anything upon merits of the case/FIR in question but considering the arguments of the learned State counsel and also the severity of the allegations leveled in the FIR in question, I find no ground to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. The petition is dismissed.

7. All interim application/s, if any, also stand/s disposed off.

(RAMESH CHANDER DIMRI)
JUDGE

14.07.2026

anju

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No