

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

.....

Criminal Misc. No.M-18625 of 2019

.....

Date of decision:20.05.2019

Sunita

...Petitioner

v.

State of Haryana

...Respondent

....

Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Inderjit Singh

.....

Present: Mr. D.S. Brar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sharad Kumar Yadav, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana
for the respondent-State.

Mr. R.S. Mamli, Advocate for the complainant.

.....

Inderjit Singh, J.

This petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for the grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.252 dated 13.9.2018 registered for the offences under Section 420 IPC at Police Station Pinjore, District Panchkula.

Notice of motion has been issued in this case.

Mr. Sharad Kumar Yadav, learned Deputy Advocate General, Haryana has put in appearance on behalf of the respondent-State and Mr. R.S. Mamli, learned Advocate has appeared for the complainant and contested this petition.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and learned State counsel and have gone through the record.

The FIR in the present case has been registered on the complaint of Ravi Kant, who stated that he met Rajesh Kumar Kaushik co-accused. During discussion, he told him that he had good acquaintance with political leaders and influential persons and he could get government job to any one. The complainant had also filled form for the job of Patwari etc. He also asked the complainant to pay ₹4,50,000/-, then he can get the job of Patwari. As per the FIR, the complainant kept on making contact with Rajesh Kumar Kaushik and Sunita upon their mobile numbers. It has been further stated that the amount was paid through cheques which were withdrawn. Thereafter, the allegations in the FIR are levelled jointly against Rajesh Kumar Kaushik and Sunita.

Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that even as per the FIR, there is no inducement or misrepresentation by the present petitioner. Rather, as per the FIR, it is by the co-accused Rajesh Kumar Kaushik.

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

In the facts and circumstances of the present case, without discussing the facts in minute detail and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, I accept this criminal miscellaneous petition and in the event of arrest, the petitioner shall be admitted to bail on her furnishing personal bonds and surety to the satisfaction of the Arresting/Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall join the investigation as and when called

upon to do so and shall abide by the conditions of Section 438 (2)
Cr.P.C.

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

May 20, 2019.

(Inderjit Singh)
Judge

hsp

NOTE:	Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes
	Whether reportable:	No