IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-23274 of 2015 (O&M)
Date of Decision:27.7.2015

Bableen Kaur

….Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

….Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NAVITA SINGH

Argued by: Mr. B.S. Tewatia, Advocate for the petitioner.
Dr. Sushil Gautam, DAG, Haryana for the respondent.
Mr. Pardeep Kumar Bajaj, Advocate for the complainant.

NAVITA SINGH, J.

1. The present case against the petitioner was launched by way of FIR No.124 dated 10.4.2015 of Police Station Udyog Vihar, Gurgaon, under Sections 406,408,420,120-B IPC and Sections 66, 66-C and 66-D of the I.T. Act.

2. The petitioner sought regular bail on the ground that she is in custody since 28.5.2015 and is not required for any further investigation. It was pleaded that she was falsely implicated. She was working with Interglobe Technologies Private Ltd. (hereinafter referred to as the firm), where she joined on 28.5.2012 and resigned from the job in November 2012. The offences, which relate to her period of work, are not made out against her, firstly because the FIR was lodged in April 2015 and secondly because during the time of her service, her record was unblemished and no fraudulent activity was conducted by her as alleged. From the allegations, it is seen that the offence was committed in December 2014 whereas she had left the firm in November 2012.

3. Counsel for the petitioner argued that the latter was being harassed for no reason and even the Additional Sessions Judge, Gurgaon rejected her request for regular bail without properly going into the facts of the matter.

4. Counsel for the firm and also the State counsel contended that it is not alleged that the petitioner had committed the offences only while she was on the rolls of the firm but the allegations against her are that while she was in service, she stole the login IDs of her colleagues and after leaving the firm she indulged in fraudulent activities. Large number of people from India and abroad got their tickets booked for which credit card of the petitioner was used and all the concessions and benefits relating to those were availed by the petitioner herself and all the amount was got deposited by her in her credit card account. Under the schemes and offers, none of the travelers got the benefit and the entire money was usurped by the petitioner.

5. Counsel for the petitioner referred to a bank account statement (Annexure P5) showing that no transaction of any such amount was made as may raise eyebrows. The statement of account pertaining to the saving bank account of the petitioner in Standard Chartered Bank would be of no avail because that must be the account officially kept by the petitioner. She may have many accounts, which were undisclosed and may have many ways to conceal the money earned by her through illegal means. State counsel submitted that the disclosure statements of the petitioner are available in the police file. Also her husband is absconding and if bail is granted to her, there is every likelihood that either she will abscond or will try to tamper with evidence.

6. The clean record of the petitioner during her few months of service will also not come to her rescue because it is alleged that she had joined the firm with ulterior motive and she must have made it a point to keep up her image and depict a demeanor as would not allow anyone to raise a finger towards her during that time. If she had misconducted herself during work, she would not have succeeded in the nefarious designs.

7. For the reasons given above, the present petition is dismissed. However, it goes without saying that anything expressed above, should not be taken to have any effect on the merits of the case.

(NAVITA SINGH)
JUDGE

27.7.2015
ishwar