

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

**CRM-M-13002 OF 2015 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 06.05.2015**

Geeta

--Petitioner.

Vs.

State of Haryana

--Respondent.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK

Present : Mr. Vikas Verma, Advocate for
Mr. Pankaj Bali, Advocate
for the petitioner.

RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK J. (ORAL)

Petitioner seeks pre-arrest bail in FIR No. 294 dated 13.4.2013 under Sections 406/420/467/468/471/120-B IPC and under Section 24 of Emigration Act, 1983, registered at Police Station Civil Lines, District Karnal.

On 24.4.2015, following order was passed by this Court:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner seeks time to get instructions whether the petitioner is ready to deposit the entire remaining amount by way of bank draft(s) in the Ankit Aggarwal, Managing Director Star Company, who is stated to be contractor of PSPCL of complainant, so as to show her bonafide.”

Thereafter, another opportunity was granted to the petitioner vide order dated 29.4.2015.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submits that petitioner had no role to play. Referring to the allegations levelled in the FIR, learned counsel for the petitioner concluded by submitting that petitioner is entitled for the concession of pre-arrest bail. He prays for allowing the present petition.

Having heard the learned counsel for the petitioner at considerable length, after careful perusal of the record of the case and giving thoughtful consideration to the contentions raised, this Court is of the considered opinion that since the allegations against the petitioner are direct and serious, she is not entitled for the concession of pre-arrest bail.

The factual position has not been denied by the learned counsel for the petitioner that petitioner has received an amount of about ₹3 lacs and she is not ready to refund the same. In such a situation, custodial investigation of the petitioner would be a compulsive necessity of the investigating agency, so as to conduct an effective investigation.

In this view of the matter, no case for pre-arrest bail is made out.

Dismissed.

(RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK)
JUDGE

06.05.2015
Ak Sharma