

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

CRM-M-15478 of 2020 (O&M)
Date of Decision:28.07.2020

Dheerja Arora

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS.JUSTICE LISA GILL

Present: Mr. Pankaj Bali, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Anmol Malik, DAG., Haryana.

LISA GILL, J(Oral).

This matter is being taken up for hearing through video conferencing due to outbreak of the pandemic, COVID-19.

Petitioner seeks the concession of anticipatory bail in FIR No.684 dated 26.12.2019, under Sections 406, 420 IPC, registered at Police Station Shahabad, District Kurukshetra.

Contentions on behalf of learned counsel for the petitioner as noted while issuing notice of motion on 17.06.2020, are reproduced as hereunder:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner inter alia contends that the petitioner has been involved in this FIR only due to the complicity of her husband in the matter. In fact, it is the petitioner who had raised a voice of caution to the complainant and this is so reflected in the affidavit of the complainant dated 20.09.2019 attached as Annexure P-2 with this petition. Number

of other cases were also registered against the petitioner with similar allegations. It is further submitted that the husband being agitated by the action of the petitioner in cautioning people against the fraud being committed by him, has also filed a petition seeking divorce from her. It is submitted that the petitioner is on bail in all other cases which have been registered against her.”

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has joined investigation and she undertakes to fully cooperate with the investigating agency and not abuse the concession of anticipatory bail, if afforded to her. It is thus prayed that this petition be allowed.

Learned counsel for the State, on instructions from ASI Krishan Lal, verifies that the petitioner has joined investigation. It is further not in dispute that the petitioner is on bail in the other cases registered against her on similar allegations. Learned counsel for the respondent-State further affirms on specific instructions that the petitioner is living separately from her husband.

There are no allegations on behalf of the State that the petitioner is likely to abscond or she is likely to dissuade the witnesses from deposing true facts before the trial Court, if granted the concession of anticipatory bail.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances as above, but without commenting upon or expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this petition is allowed. Consequently, order dated 17.06.2020, is made absolute.

It is clarified that none of the observations made hereinabove shall be construed to be a reflection on the merits of the case. The same are

solely confined for the purpose of decision of the present petition.

28.07.2020

s.khan

Whether speaking/reasoned

Whether reportable

:

:

Yes/No.

Yes/No.

[LISA GILL]

Judge