

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

CRM-M-25630-2021 (O&M)
Date of decision: 07.07.2021

Seema Rani

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Abhimanyu Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

Case is taken up for hearing through video conferencing.

Through the instant petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C., the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 243 dated 24.06.2021, registered under Sections 406, 420 IPC, (later on Sections 506 and 120-B IPC were added later on), at Police Station Jagadhari, District Yamuna Nagar.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case. It is a matter of civil nature, but has been given a criminal colour. There is no direct link between the complainant and petitioner. The allegations are totally based on presumptions.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of this Court, Mr. Ashok Singh Chaudhary, Addl. A.G., Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

At this stage, Mr. Akshit Aggarwal, Advocate, appears and files vakalatnama on behalf of the complainant.

Learned State counsel assisted by the counsel for the complainant, while opposing the prayer for bail, submits that the petitioner along with other accused persons is running a fake gold racket and cheated the complainant by inducing him to deliver a total amount of Rs. 1,35,00000/- on the pre-text of supplying 19 kgs. gold. He further submits that as the investigation is still going on and there are specific allegations against the petitioner, the petitioner is not entitled to the concession of the bail.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

The allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature and the investigation is going on. There is an apprehension that in case the petitioner is granted anticipatory bail, she may commit such or similar offence again in future and every effort may be made by her to either tamper with the evidence or win over the witnesses.

In view of the above, I do not find any ground to grant her the concession of anticipatory bail.

Dismissed.

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

07.07.2021

Mangal Singh

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No