

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

**CRM No.M-32324 of 2017 (O&M)
Date of Decision: July 17, 2018**

Reshma Pall

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr.J.S.Bedi, Senior Advocate with
Mr.Sonepreet Singh Brar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr.Sukhdeep Parmar, DAG, Haryana
for the respondent-State.

Mr.Akshay Bhan, Senior Advocate with
Mr.H.P.S.Sandhu, Advocate
for the complainant.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

Petitioner has filed this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.232 dated 07.06.2016 under Sections 406, 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B IPC, registered at Police Station Sushant Lok, Gurugram.

Notice of motion was issued. Learned State counsel as well as learned counsel for the complainant appeared and contested the petition.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties as well as learned

State counsel and have gone through the record.

From the record, I find that the FIR has been registered on the statement of Smt.Sudesh Sood. As per the allegations in the FIR, Rajiv Kumar was having good relations with the family of Smt.Sudesh Sood, who went to foreign country and has given General Power of Attorney, signed cheque book and blank signed documents to Rajiv Kumar. Later on, she came to know that whole of her money has been siphoned off. Allegation against the present petitioner is that she is wife of Rajiv Kumar and also misappropriated the amount etc. and was in conspiracy with Rajiv Kumar.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that petitioner Reshma married with Rajiv Kumar on 11.03.2015 whereas GPA and other documents were given to Rajiv Kumar by the complainant much earlier. As per the FIR, the complainant left India in the year 2011. It is further contended that there is matrimonial dispute between petitioner Reshma and her husband Rajiv Kumar. Learned counsel for the petitioner also contended that complainant has compromised with the main accused Rajiv Kumar and he has been released on regular bail and bail has been granted mainly on the ground of compromise with the complainant.

The petitioner has already joined the investigation. She is not required for investigation or custodial interrogation. No useful purpose will be served by sending the petitioner to custody.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and without discussing the facts of the case in minute details and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, I find it a fit case, where the petitioner is entitled to benefit of anticipatory bail. Therefore, the present petition is accepted and the order dated 01.09.2017 granting interim

bail to the petitioner, is made absolute.

However, nothing stated above, shall constitute my opinion on merits of the case.

July 17, 2018
Vgulati

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes
No