

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

Criminal Misc.No.M-37441 of 2015

Date of Decision: November 02, 2015

Anju Sharma

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Union Territory, Chandigarh

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NARESH KUMAR SANGHI

Present: Mr.S.S.Rangi, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Naresh Kumar Sanghi, J.(Oral)

Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 438, Cr.P.C., is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, Anju Sharma, who has been booked for having committed the offences punishable under Sections 408 and 420, IPC, in a case arising out of FIR No.294, dated 25.09.2015, registered at Police Station, Industrial Area, UT, Chandigarh.

Learned counsel contends that every year the accounts of the firm to which the petitioner was an employee was being audited by the auditors and no infirmity was found; at the time of inquiry, ₹18,00,000/- (Rupees eighteen lacs only) were found in the bank account of the petitioner whereas, as per allegations of the informant/complainant, embezzlement was to the tune of ₹2.5 crores (Rupees two crores and fifty lacs only); and that in the

First Information Report, the detailed account statement with regard to embezzlement of the amount has not been given.

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

As per the prosecution version, the petitioner was working as a computer operator-cum-godown incharge since February, 2012 in M/S G.V.D Agencies having its office at S.C.O.No.913, First Floor, N.A.C., Manimajra, Chandigarh, while its godown was at village Daria, Changiarh. The petitioner used to deal with the accounts concerning M/s Adani Wilman Limited near Navrang Pura, Ahmadabad, of the stock of the goods. In the month of June, 2013, the petitioner started misappropriating the goods. The petitioner adopted a unique method to misappropriate the stock by making wrong entries in the computer to show that articles were received as scrap and thereafter used to sell the same in the market. Within a span of two years, she misappropriated the goods valuing ₹2.5 crores (Rupees two crores and fifty lacs only). From the perusal of the FIR, it appears that the petitioner not only committed the offences punishable under Sections 408 and 420, IPC, but also maintained the incorrect record. The custodial interrogation of the petitioner would facilitate the Investigating Agency to unveil the modus adopted by the petitioner for commission of the offences.

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

Dismissed.

November 2, 2015
seema

(Naresh Kumar Sanghi)
Judge