

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND
HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

202 CRM-M-19906-2017 (O&M)
Date of Decision-12.06.2017

TARUNDEEP KAURPetitioner

V/S

STATE OF PUNJABRespondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Sandeep Arora, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajesh Mehta, Addl. A.G., Punjab
assisted by ASI Simarjit Singh.

Mr. Gautam Kaile, Advocate for the complainant.

Amol Rattan Singh, J. (Oral)

Learned counsel for the petitioner has made a specific statement to the effect that the petitioner is not a director in the company of which her co-accused, i.e. Tejwant Singh, Mukesh Kumar Sharma and Neha Kalia, are directors.

Towards that he has pointed to the Memorandum of Association and Articles of Association (Annexures P-3 and P-4).

Learned counsel for the State has submitted that the petitioner has admitted, under signature, before the police that she is a director, to which learned counsel for the petitioner submits that she is only an authorized signatory.

Without making any comment to the aforesaid, seeing that the petitioner is obviously actively involved in the company, being an authorized signatory, the petition stands dismissed.

12.06.2017
ashok/pankaj

[AMOL RATTAN SINGH]
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No