

**In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana  
At Chandigarh**

CRM-M-22574-2019 (O&M)  
Date of Decision:-20.5.2019

Nisha ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL**

Present:- Mr. Naresh Kumar Manchanda, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Rashmi Attri, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*\*

**GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J.**(Oral)

The petitioner has approached this Court seeking grant of anticipatory bail in respect of a case registered against her vide FIR No.82 dated 2.5.2019 registered at Police Station City South Moga, District Moga under Sections 420, 464, 465, 468 and 406 of Indian Penal Code, 1860.

The FIR was lodged at the instance of Deepinder Singh, wherein it has been alleged that he has been duped of an amount of ₹8 lacs by Nisha on the pretext of sending the complainant abroad. It is alleged that Nisha had represented that she earlier sent 3-4 boys to Germany and that she could send the complainant abroad in lieu of an amount of ₹20 lacs. The complaint being taken in by the said representation initially paid an amount of ₹2 lacs and thereafter another amount of ₹4 lacs on one occasion and yet

another amount of ₹2 lacs. However, the complainant was not sent abroad. Subsequently, upon persistence of the complainant, a cheque for an amount of ₹5 lacs was given but the same upon its presentation was dishonoured.

The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case and that infact the aforesaid cheque of ₹5 lacs is a cheque which has been misused by the accused and that the said cheque was infact a blank cheque given by the petitioner's mother to Sunil Sood for the purchase of a mobile phone.

Opposing the petition, the learned State counsel has submitted that since there are categoric allegations against the accused, no case for grant of bail is made. It has further been pointed out that the cheque in question infact pertains to account of petitioner's mother but has been signed by the petitioner, which clearly shows her intention to cheat the complainant.

Having considered rival submissions addressed before this Court and the manner in which the complainant had been deprived of an amount of ₹8 lacs and also that the petitioner further gave a cheque for an amount of ₹5 lacs, which infact is signed by her although it has been issued from her mother's account, shows the intention of the petitioner. This case does not justify grant of anticipatory bail. The petition is sans merit and is hereby dismissed.

**20.5.2019**

pankaj

**(Gurvinder Singh Gill)  
Judge**

Whether speaking /reasoned

Yes / No

Whether Reportable

Yes / No