

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

**CRM-M No. 42592 of 2020
Date of decision: 18.12.2020.**

Rashu Mutneja

..... Petitioner.

Versus

State of Punjab and another

..... Respondents.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Bipan Ghai, Senior Advocate, with
Mr. Paras Talwar, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Dhruv Dayal, Senior DAG, Punjab, for respondent No. 1.

ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

Heard through video conferencing.

The petitioner is seeking anticipatory bail in FIR No. 222 dated 23.11.2018, under Sections 420, 406 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC' - for short) (Sections 409, 465, 467, 468 and 471 of the IPC and Section 7/13 (1) (A) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, added later on), registered at Police Station Guru Har Sahai, District Ferozepur.

Learned senior counsel appearing for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that the allegations against the petitioner, who is the proprietor of M/s Dhruv Commission Agent, are that she along with others had allegedly shown bogus purchases. He, however, contends that the amount, which was to be disbursed to the farmers, has been deposited by the petitioner with the department and in the inquiry conducted by the Punjab Mandi Board, it was found that after purchase from the farmers, the paddy had been stored in the

rice mill. He also contends that co-accused, namely, Sandeep Kumar has been granted *ad interim* anticipatory bail by a Coordinate Bench of this Court by order dated 01.12.2020 passed in CRM-M No. 39746 of 2020.

Heard.

This is the second petition for anticipatory bail preferred by the petitioner. The first petition was dismissed by a Coordinate Bench of this Court by order dated 25.01.2019 passed in CRM-M No. 1359 of 2019. The allegations against the petitioner are that she is the proprietor of M/s Dhruv Commission Agent and she along with the proprietors of three other concerns in connivance with the inspector of PUNSUP had shown bogus purchases although no such purchase had been made. The amount, which had been paid to them for disbursement to the farmers, was not disbursed to the farmers. A huge loss has also been caused to the PUNSUP. The petitioner cannot absolve herself from the alleged commission of offence merely on the ground that she had deposited the amount with the department later. The first petition of the petitioner has already been dismissed. In view of aforementioned facts and circumstances, I do not find any good ground to take another view in the matter at this stage.

Consequently, the petition stands dismissed.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

18.12.2020
Ramesh

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No