

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

**C.R.M-M No.40510 of 2015
Date of Decision : 11.12.2015**

Suman Lata

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present : Mr. Anil Kumar Garg, Advocate
for the petitioner.

1. Whether Reporters of local papers 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)

This petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.154 dated 10.11.2013, registered under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC, at Police Station Division No.6, Industrial Area, Ludhiana.

The allegations were that the petitioner and her husband were tenants of one Smt. Lalita Bhandari-complainant. They represented to her that they are relatives of one Pritam Singh who had property to sell and since she had the money she should invest in the same. Pursuant to that they showed her two plots allegedly owned by aforesaid Pritam Singh. Thereafter on the pretext of an agreement to sell purportedly executed by Pritam Singh in favour of Lalita Bhandari they took an amount of Rs.8 lakhs

from the complainant. It has subsequently transpired that Pritam Singh was a fake person. The husband of the petitioner also issued two cheques to return the said money under the pressure of the complainant which were dishonoured. The earlier petition filed for anticipatory bail was dismissed by this Court on merits. The second petition has been filed on the ground that the eye witness of the transactions of handing over of Rs.8 lakhs has stated that at that time the petitioner was not present.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that this proves that the petitioner has no role to play in the entire conspiracy.

In my opinion, merely because the petitioner was not present at the time when the money was handed over to her husband would not exculpate her since the complainant was defrauded over a period of time and that fraud had many steps.

In the circumstances, the petition is dismissed.

Since the main case has been decided, the pending criminal miscellaneous application, if any, also stands disposed of.

December 11, 2015

ashish

**(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE**