

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

Crl. Misc. No.M-45874 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of Decision: February 08, 2017

Rajbala

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present:- Mr. Rahul Deswal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Kuldeep Tiwari, Addl. Advocate General, Haryana

Amol Rattan Singh, J. (ORAL)

Learned counsel for the petitioner points out that the complainant is admittedly a retired Clerk from the Indian Air Force, who has made an allegation against the petitioner that after taking Rs.58 lacs from him, ostensibly for investing in some “committee”, she would give him high returns per month, which had not been done.

It is stated that he has also made allegation against two other persons, namely Nisha and Simmi, to the effect that they too have taken Rs.14 lacs and Rs.8 lacs from him respectively, for the same purpose.

He submits that despite an earlier enquiry also on the issue, other contentions apart, the complainant could not explain the source of income from which he had invested the aforesaid amount, totalling Rs.80 lacs.

Learned State counsel, on instructions, submits that though the petitioner has joined investigation, she is allegedly not cooperating in the investigation, inasmuch as she has not returned the money which it is

alleged she has taken.

Upon instructions, learned State counsel also submits that the source of income of the complainant, in respect of the amounts he allegedly invested, has not been disclosed by the complainant.

Keeping in view the aforesaid facts, including the earlier investigation conducted on the same issue, with the complainant also not disclosing his source of income, the order dated 18.01.2017 is made absolute, on the same terms and conditions. However, no comment is made on the actual merits of the case.

The petition disposed of accordingly.

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

February 08, 2017
vcgarg

Whether reasoned/speaking: Yes
Whether reportable: no