

Savitri

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SUDHIR MITTAL

Present: Mr. Sumit Sangwan, Advocate
for the petitioner

Mr. D.R. Singla, DAG Haryana

-.-

Sudhir Mittal, J. (Oral)

The petitioner is seeking anticipatory bail in FIR No. 339 dated 04.09.2017 under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 506 IPC, registered at Police Station City Dadri, District Charkhi Dadri.

2. Vide order dated 28.09.2017, interim bail was granted to the petitioner. Thereafter, the matter was adjourned from time to time to enable her to give the whereabouts of her son who is the co-accused and has allegedly taken a sum of Rs. 11 lacs from the complainant.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is not aware of the whereabouts of her son and that she is not in possession of the sum of Rs. 11 lacs.

4. Learned State counsel, on the other hand submits that the thumb impression of the petitioner is available on the receipt of Rs. 11 lacs and as per the FSL report the thumb impression is that of the petitioner herself. Moreover, the petitioner is able to walk of her own and possesses the comprehensions expected

of an ordinary human being. Thus, the statement of the learned counsel for the

petitioner that she was duped by her own son is not believable.

5. Keeping in view the above circumstances, I do not consider this to be an appropriate case for grant of anticipatory bail. The petition is, accordingly, dismissed.

July 03, 2018

reena

[SUDHIR MITTAL]
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether Reportable : Yes/No