

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM No. M-14426 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 29.04.2016

Aruna Tuli

--Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

--Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.

Present:- Mr. Amrinder Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.J

The present petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C praying for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case F.I.R. No.1037 dated 14.11.2014 under sections 420, 406 I.P.C (sections 467, 468, 471 I.P.C were added later on), registered at Police Station, City Karnal, District Karnal.

Counsel for the petitioner has been heard at length.

Allegations in a nutshell are against the present petitioner as also her husband with regard to a total sum of Rs.17,35,000/- having been entrusted over different points of time to be deposited in the post office saving schemes and such money having been misappropriated. Complainants alleged that entries with regard to such deposits were also interpolated in the passbooks and they subsequently became aware that the amount in question had actually not been deposited by the petitioner as also her husband.

The contention raised by the counsel is that there was no entrustment of money to the present petitioner. Further submitted that her husband may have had dealings with the complainants and who has gone missing since 13.9.2014 and for which a separate F.I.R stands lodged and in

any case the present petitioner, who is a lady aged 62 years cannot be held responsible for the dealings of her husband.

Having heard learned counsel for the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to extend in favour of the petitioner the concession of pre-arrest bail.

During the course of arguments, it stands conceded by the counsel that the present petitioner has been working as a authorized agent on behalf of the postal authorities. It has further been conceded that the license for such work is in the name of the present petitioner.

The allegations made by complainants are specific as regards entrustment not only to the husband of the present petitioner but to the petitioner herself as well.

As opposed to the impression sought to be given that the present petitioner is merely a housewife, counsel during the course of arguments also admitted that the petitioner has been engaged in such work of collection of money and making deposits with postal authorities since the year 1982.

Allegations are categoric and serious in nature.

It is a case which would require a deep and thorough probe and for which custodial interrogation of the petitioner may well be warranted.

Petition is dismissed.

(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE

29.04.2016
lucky