

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

**CRM-M No.13953 of 2020  
Date of decision:04.06.2020**

Jaita Rani

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL**

Present:- Mr. Namit Khurana, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sukhdeep Parmar, DAG, Haryana.

**SUVIR SEHGAL J.**

The Court has been convened through video conferencing due to Covid-19 pandemic.

Present petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. with prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, namely, Jaita Rani daughter of Sh. Pardeep Kumar in FIR No.400 dated 02.04.2019, Annexure P-1, under Sections 420, 419, 120-B and 201 (added later on) IPC, registered at Police Station Jagadhari City, District Yamuna Nagar.

In brief, the prosecution case is that on 02.04.2019 a complaint was received from Ravinder Kumar, Clerk in the office of Deputy Commissioner, Yamuna Nagar alleging that on 12.03.2019, when he was on duty in the camp office of Deputy Commissioner, he received a telephonic call from phone no.15595450230 and 18312882683 by some

person who impersonated himself as Nripendra Misra, Chief Secretary, office of Prime Minister and requested for transfer of call to the Deputy Commissioner. Again on 13.03.2019, a call was received from phone No.15597258407 on landline of D.C. office by an impersonator who mentioned his name as Ashish, P.A. to Chief Secretary. He asked that Jaita Rani, present petitioner, be appointed in the office of the Deputy Commissioner. The Deputy Commissioner was busy in a meeting and could not take the call. Later, on inquiry, the three phone numbers were found not to be of the office of the Prime Minister. On the basis of the complaint, the aforementioned FIR was lodged. During investigation, Pardeep Kumar, father of the petitioner and Deepak Kumar, brother of the petitioner were arrested on 22.05.2020.

Counsel for petitioner has argued that no doubt the petitioner had applied for appointment in the office of the Deputy Commissioner but the same was on contract basis and that she had no knowledge about the impersonation or about the calls having been made on her behalf. It has been contended by the counsel that in fact the calls were counterblast to FIR bearing No.45 dated 06.03.2019 which had been registered by her against her in-laws at Police Station Women, Yamuna Nagar. He has submitted that the other co-accused have been granted regular bail by the Sessions Court.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Sukhdeep Parmar, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. Opposing the petition, he has submitted that the petitioner was very much a part of the conspiracy wherein by taking the names of high officials an attempt had

been made to influence the office of the Deputy Commissioner. He further submits that the numbers from which the calls were allegedly made have been found to be connected with the father and the brother of the petitioner as they had used these numbers for making calls through computer to the in-laws of the petitioner.

I have considered the rival submissions.

The complaint has been lodged by a government official in the discharge of his official duty whereby he has alleged that not only an attempt has been made to involve the office of the Deputy Commissioner but also officials of a high office of the country were named. Though the calls made to the office of the Deputy Commissioner were not made by the petitioner but the fact remains that she was the alleged beneficiary. The fact that she had applied for a post in the Deputy Commissioner's Office is also a circumstance which goes against her. Repeated attempts had been made to contact the Deputy Commissioner by impersonating as officials working in the office of the Prime Minister. The father and brother of the petitioner had been arrested and they were released on regular bail. However, this in no way benefits the case of the petitioner. It is pertinent to mention that during the investigation, the phone numbers have been found to be linked to the father and brother of the petitioner. Therefore, the story of counterblast by the in-laws of the petitioner does not hold water. In view of the fact that the names of high functionaries of the government have been misused, the petitioner is not entitled to the concession of anticipatory bail. Her custodial interrogation is necessary to determine her role in the alleged conspiracy. The petition is accordingly dismissed.

It is clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case.

04.06.2020

pooja saini

(SUVIR SEHGAL)  
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned : Yes/No

Whether Reportable : Yes/No