

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

209)

CRM-M-36249-2019 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 20.09.2019

Manu Chadha

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present:- Mr. Aman Bansal, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Surinder Singh, AAG, Haryana

Amol Rattan Singh, J. (Oral)

Learned State counsel, on instructions from Sub-Inspector Kuldeep, submits that there are other such cases also registered against the petitioner, with similar allegations, that she was duping people into parting with money on the pretext of providing them jobs in the Railways.

Though learned counsel for the petitioner submits that even the complainants in those cases are not appearing before the trial court, it is difficult to believe that (at least for the purpose of this petition under Section 438 of the Cr.P.C.), that the petitioner, on whose behalf it was contended on September 02, 2019 before this Court that her husband is “a poor driver” and therefore there would be no occasion for her to promise jobs to people, as to why she would be named as an accused by different people, if she is such a poor person.

Consequently, without making any comment on the actual merits of the case, for or against the petitioner, I find no reason to entertain this petition.

Dismissed.

However, nothing stated herein above would be taken to be an observation on the merits of the case, which would be gone into by the investigating agency as per the evidence gathered by it and the trial court (if it comes to that stage), on the basis of the evidence led before it.

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

20.09.2019
vcgarg

Whether reasoned/speaking: Yes
Whether reportable: No