

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANAAT
CHANDIGARH**

CRM No.M- 42508 of 2014(O&M)

Date of Decision: January 22, 2015.

Shweta @ Saroj

..... PETITIONER (s)

Versus

State of Haryana

..... RESPONDENT (s)

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS.JUSTICE LISA GILL

Present: Mrs. Sharmila Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. P.S.Sullar, Addl.A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Suresh Kumar Kaushik, Advocate
for the complainant.

LISA GILL, J.

Petitioner prays for the grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.412 dated 31.10.2014, under Sections 406/420/120B IPC, registered at police station Sadar, District Panipat.

As per the prosecution version, co-accused Shamsher (husband of the petitioner) and Sandeep told the complainant that petitioner – Shweta @ Saroj is a close friend of the wife of Mr. Deepender Hooda, Member of Parliament and has influence in the bureaucracy as well. Complainant was also assured of their relation with numerous IAS/IPS officers. On the pretext of procuring a licence for Petrol Pump and Kisan Sewa Kendra as well as

procuring a job of Assistant Superintendent of Jail for the complainant's relative, Sunil and a job in the Haryana Police for complainant's son, a sum of ₹63,00,000/- from the complainant and ₹60,00,000/- from one Dilawar have been fraudulently extracted by the petitioner and the other co-accused on different dates.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there is no evidence, whatsoever, regarding handing over of this money and the petitioner as well as the other accused, who are still at large, have been falsely implicated in the abovesaid FIR. She has been unnecessarily dragged into this litigation to blackmail her husband.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and gone through the file.

There are specific allegations against the petitioner of having received money for procuring the licence of two petrol pumps, Kisan Sewa Kendra and jobs for the son and a relative of the complainant. Petitioner and co-accused were deliberately projected as being very close to influential people thereby, inducing the complainant and others to part with their money.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case, I do not find it just and expedient to extend the benefit of anticipatory bail to petitioner.

Dismissed.

(**LISA GILL**)
JUDGE

January 22, 2015.
'om'