

209

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

CRM-M-25915 of 2015

Date of Decision: August 20, 2015.

Meena Rani

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SABINA

Present: Mr. P.S. Dhaliwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. R.P.S. Sidhu, AAG Punjab.

Mr. Ankur Mittal, Advocate for
Mr. Gaurav Singla, Advocate
for the complainant.

SABINA, J.

Petitioner has filed this petition under Section 438 of Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 seeking anticipatory bail in FIR No.165 dated 25.06.2015, under Sections 420, 406, 506, 120-B of Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station City Barnala, District Barnala.

Prosecution story in brief is that petitioner along with her husband went to the house of the complainant-Madan Lal in April 2014 and assured that in case, they invest money in their company, they would be getting monthly interest at the rate of 6%. Complainant and his wife gave ₹7,00,000/- to Parmod Kumar, who further handed over the same to the petitioner and she kept the same in her purse.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been falsely involved in this case merely because she is the wife of Parmod Kumar. In fact, husband of the petitioner

had moved an application against Crystal Wind Trade Company before the registration of the present FIR, but no action had been taken on the same so far.

Learned State counsel who is assisted by the counsel for the complainant on the other hand has opposed the petition and has submitted that during investigation, statement of Rajinder Kumar was recorded and he had stated that the petitioner and her husband had taken ₹6,50,000/- from him. Learned State counsel has further submitted that statement of Kuldeep Sood was also recorded during investigation and he had stated that the petitioner and her co-accused had taken ₹10,00,000/- from him. Statement of Kuldeep Sharma was also recorded during investigation who had stated that petitioner and her co-accused has taken ₹1,50,000/- from him. Petitioner is required for custodial interrogation.

In the present case, allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature. Although, FIR in question was registered on the basis of the statement made by Madan Lal but during investigation, it has transpired that the petitioner and her co-accused have also duped other persons of their hard-earned money. Petitioner is required for custodial interrogation.

Keeping in view the seriousness of allegations levelled against the petitioner, no ground for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, is made out.

Dismissed.

**(SABINA)
JUDGE**

August 20, 2015
mahavir