

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

**Criminal Misc.No.M-261 of 2015 (O&M)
Date of Decision: January 07, 2015**

Roma @ Kamal Sobti

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NARESH KUMAR SANGHI

Present: Mr.Bhanu Kaushik, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Naresh Kumar Sanghi, J.(Oral)

CRM-287-2015

Prayer in this application is for exemption from filing the certified copies of Annexure P-1 and for placing on record Annexure P-1.

Allowed as prayed for.

The applicant is exempted from filing the certified copies of Annexure P-1. Annexure P-1 is also taken on record.

CRM-M-261-2015

Prayer in this petition is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, Roma @ Komal, who has been booked for having committed the offences punishable under Sections 323, 406, 420 and 506 read with Section 34, IPC, in a case arising out of FIR No.1120, dated 13.11.2014, registered at Police Station,

Chandni Bagh, Panipat.

Learned counsel contends that the petitioner is an employee of accused no.1 and getting a salary of Rs.10,000/- per month; the petitioner had not done anything which may attract the essential ingredients of the offences for which she has been booked. The co-accused, Ayub Khan, was arrested by the Delhi police in some other case; accused No.1, Narinder Singh Chadha, has been arrested by the Panipat police and he is behind the bars; the petitioner is ready to join the investigation; the complainant had an alternative remedy to file the complaint under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act for bouncing of the cheques and that the petitioner is 45 years old lady who is mother of a marriageable daughter.

I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and with his able assistance gone through the material available on record.

As per the allegations, the petitioner along with her co-accused approached the complainant and induced him to prepare 15,000 blankets costing more than Rs.17,00,000. In three transactions, 15,000 blankets were supplied to the accused persons by the complainant against which two cheques were issued by the accused persons but on inquiry, the complainant found that there was no transaction in the bank

since 2013 and as such, he doubted the credibility of the accused persons. In spite of repeated requests, the accused persons failed to make the payment. This Court is of the prima facie opinion that from the very beginning the petitioner and her co-accused had a mala-fide intention to commit cheating with the complainant. When the complainant requested to make the payment then he was not only intimidated but also thrashed by the accused persons.

No ground for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner is made out.

Dismissed.

January 07, 2015
seema

(Naresh Kumar Sanghi)
Judge