

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH****CRM-M-44065-2020 (O&M)****Date of Decision: 08.01.2021**

Geeta

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. Akbarjit Singh, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Ajay Pal Singh Gill, DAG, Punjab,
assisted by SI Avtar Singh.*(proceedings conducted through video conferencing)***GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (Oral)**

1. The petitioner has approached this Court seeking grant of regular bail in respect of a case registered vide FIR No.192 dated 31.10.2020 at Police Station Division No.1 Jalandhar Police Commissionerate under Sections 406, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC.
2. The FIR in question was lodged at the instance of Sita Rani, wherein it has been alleged that her husband had expired on 10.06.2015 in a vehicular accident and on account of which she had instituted a case seeking compensation in MACT, Jalandhar. Since the complainant did not have much knowledge about the Court procedure, therefore, her *Jija* (brother-in-law) and her sister were pursuing the same. It is alleged that the said case came to be decided on 02.07.2018 and after the decision of the same, she opened a bank account on the asking of her brother-in-law Manjit

Singh, so that she could get the compensation amount credited therein. The complainant was given a cheque book in respect of the said account. The complainant alleges that thereafter Manjit Singh asked her to hand over the cheque book to him so that he can use the same for withdrawing the money. Later, when the complainant went to the bank to get the pass-book updated, she came to know that on 06.02.2019, Manjit Singh in connivance with other accused i.e. his wife; the Branch Manager, Vijay Bank (now Bank of Baroda), Basti Sheikh Road, Jalandhar and the Branch Manager, Vijay Bank (now Bank of Baroda) Branch New Delhi had withdrawn an amount of Rs.3,83,000/- through a cheque. Although the complainant requested the petitioner and her husband to return the amount, but to no avail.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that she has falsely been implicated in the present case and that in any case even if the contents of FIR are taken to be correct, it is Manjit Singh, who is the main accused, who has taken the cheque book from the complainant and who can be held responsible for the alleged withdrawal of amount. Learned counsel has further submitted that the petitioner in any case deserves the concession of bail on the ground that she is a lady having 3 years old child, who is confined alongwith her in jail.
4. Opposing the petition, learned State counsel has submitted that since the petitioner is none else, but the wife of Manjit Singh and her name figures in the FIR, her complicity is clearly evident and as such, she does not deserve the concession of bail. Learned State

counsel has, however, informed that as on date the petitioner has been behind bars since the last about 2 months and that she is not involved in any other case.

5. Having considered the rival submissions addressed before this Court, this Court finds that the main allegations in the instant case are against co-accused Manjit Singh. The petitioner in any case is a lady and is stated to be having a 3 years old child and is not stated to be involved in any other case. In these circumstances, further detention of the petitioner will not serve any useful purpose as the conclusion of trial will take some time. The petition, as such, is accepted and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on her furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

08.01.2021

Vimal

(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

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