

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

206

**CRM-M-31313-2021
Date of Decision:10.12.2021**

Simran Tyagi ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. Yashveer Kharb, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Ms. Sheenu Sura, DAG, Haryana
assisted by ASI Mahavir.

(proceedings conducted through video conferencing)

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has approached this Court seeking grant of anticipatory bail in respect of a case registered against her vide FIR No.0370 dated 31.10.2019 at Police Station Civil Line Sonipat, District Sonipat, under Sections 406/420 IPC (Sections 467/468/471 IPC were added later on).
2. At the time of issuance of notice of motion dated 06.08.2021, the following order was passed:

“The petitioner seeks grant of anticipatory bail in respect of a case registered against him vide FIR No.0370 dated 31.10.2019 at Police Station Civil Line Sonipat, District Sonipat, under Sections 406/420 IPC (Sections 467/468/471 IPC have been added later on).

The FIR in question was lodged by 7 complainants, wherein it is alleged that one Neelam, Manager and Sushil Kumar Tyagi, Director, Jan Chetna Company, Sikka Colony, Sonipat, had enticed them in investing amount in their company while

holding out a promise that same would be doubled in two years and on account of said representation, they all had invested an amount of Rs.1 crore, but despite a period of three years having completed, they have not been given the proceeds in respect of their investment/s.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that she is nowhere named in the FIR and is sought to be nominated as an accused in order to pressurize Sushil Kumar Tyagi, as the petitioner happens to be his wife. It has further been submitted that the petitioner has been nominated on the basis of a disclosure statement allegedly made by her own husband and that she had been involved identically in two other FIRs, wherein she was found to be innocent.

Notice of motion for 10.12.2021.

xxx xxx xxx”

3. Learned State counsel upon instructions has informed that pursuant to interim directions issued by this Court, the petitioner has since joined investigation and is not required for any custodial interrogation though she happens to be involved in 3 other cases.
4. In view of the aforestated position, wherein the petitioner, who is a lady, is stated to have joined investigation and is not required for any custodial interrogation, the petition is accepted and the interim directions issued by this Court vide order dated 06.08.2021 are hereby made absolute subject to the condition that the petitioner shall join investigation as and when called upon to do so and cooperate with the Investigating Officer and shall also abide by the conditions as provided under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.

10.12.2021

VY/Vimal

(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No