

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No. 32925 of 2015 (O&M)

Date of decision : December 18, 2015

Rachna Jodan

..... Petitioner

v.

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present : Mr. Akshay Bhan, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. GS Sandhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Harpreet Kaur, AAG Haryana

Mr. Manjeet Singh, Advocate
for the complainant.

- 1. Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers may be allowed to see the judgment ?**
- 2. To be referred to the Reporters or not ?**
- 3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest ?**

Ajay Tewari, J (Oral)

Prayer is for grant of pre-arrest bail in case FIR No.38 dated 20.2.2015 registered under Sections 420, 467, 468, 172 of the IPC, at Police Station Purani Sabzi Mandi, District Rohtak.

Allegations against the petitioner are that she had defrauded many persons by promising them jobs in various government organizations like Delhi Development Authority and had also issued forged appointment letters. The complainant had mentioned one telephone number on which

they allegedly talked to the petitioner and had also recorded some conversation.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the offending telephone number is not in the name of the petitioner.

Vide order dated 30.10.2015, this Court had observed as under:-

“ Learned Assistant Advocate General, on instructions from SI Bal Krishan prays for one week's time to enable him to unearth this facet as to how it can be established that the offending phone was being used by the petitioner....”

On the last date of hearing, a status report was filed as per which the police traced the persons, who had been contacted from the telephone alleged to have been used by the petitioner, and they all corroborated that they had talked with the petitioner on this number.

Learned senior counsel for the petitioner on the other hand has argued that against many of those persons, the petitioner had already filed complaint and even as regard the allegations that one of the victims was got examined in Ram Manohar Lohia Hospital, New Delhi, the petitioner has now obtained information under the RTI Act to the effect that no such person was ever examined at Ram Manohar Lohia Hospital on the said date.

The issue before this Court is whether there is credible information that the phone in question was being used by the petitioner. At this stage, the fact that some of those persons had prior dispute with the petitioner would not be determinative.

Without commenting upon the merits of the case and taking into account the gravity of the offence, I do not find any ground to grant the

benefit of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Consequently, this petition is dismissed.

December 18, 2015
`manoj/kk'

(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE