IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-28220-2020 (O&M)
Date of decision: 17.09.2020

Simran Tyagi

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present: Mr. Nilesh Bhardwaj, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sumit Jain, Addl. AG, Haryana.

Mr. J.S. Saneta, Advocate
for the complainant.

****

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (ORAL)

Prayer in this petition is for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.769 dated 20.09.2019 under Sections 406, 420, 506, 120-B IPC, registered at Police Station City Panipat.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that as per allegations in the FIR, registered at the instance of Kashmiri Lal, against Sushil Tyagi, husband of the petitioner, petitioner Simran Tyagi, Mohit Bajaj, Savita and

Neelam, the petitioner and other accused have opened office in the name of Jan Chetna Market Network Pvt. Ltd. and they were alluring the people to make investment in the said company with an assurance that heavy return will be given to them. It is further stated in the FIR that later on, after collecting Rs.15.00 crores from the general public, which includes about 1500 members, the petitioner and others have closed the office and have shifted to some other place. It is further stated that the petitioner and co-accused have cheated the complainant and similarly situated hundreds of investors, who have deposited their hard-earned money. It is also submitted that the petitioner is a housewife, having three children and there is no direct allegation against her.

Learned State counsel, assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, has opposed the prayer for bail on the ground that apart from the present FIR, some other cases are also registered against directors of the company Jan Chetna Market Network Pvt. Ltd., who have cheated the general public of crores of rupees.

Learned counsel for the complainant has additionally argued that on an allurement given by all the accused persons, investors/victims invested their hard-earned money and when the maturity time came, they were given cheques and the same were dishonoured, therefore, intention of the petitioner and other accused to cheat the victims is apparent from the very beginning, when they opened the office of the company. It is further submitted that in the documents of the company, the petitioner is shown as director along with others and therefore, she is directly involved in the case.

After hearing learned counsel for the parties and looking into the serious allegations against the petitioner, I find no ground to grant her anticipatory bail.

Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.

[ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN]
JUDGE

17.09.2020
vishnu

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether Reportable : Yes/No