

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

**CRM-M No.24403 of 2021
Date of Decision: 24.02.2022**

Anita Verma

.....Petitioner.

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent.

(Heard through Video-Conferencing)

CORAM: *HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA*

Present:- Mr. Pratham Sethi, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Samina Dhir, DAG, Punjab
for the respondent-State.

MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA, J.

Apprehending her arrest in the criminal case arising out of the FIR bearing No.343 dated 17.09.2020 registered at Police Station City Faridkot, District Faridkot, under Sections 406, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC, the petitioner has preferred this petition for seeking the relief of anticipatory bail.

Bereft of unnecessary details, the allegations, as levelled by complainant Nirpreet Singh in the subject FIR, are that the petitioner and her co-accused named Ravi Verma, i.e her husband and Mayank had duped them of an amount of Rs.15 lacs on the pretext that they were having some

financial problem and they would repay the above-said amount along-with interest thereon but they have not repaid the afore-said amount and rather, the cheque worth Rs.5 lacs, as issued by the petitioner in favour of his (complainant's) father, has also been dishonoured.

Status-report has already been filed on behalf of the respondent-State by way of the affidavit of the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub-Divison, Faridkot.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel in the instant petition and have also perused the file thoroughly.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner had no role to play in the alleged crime nor she was a beneficiary of the said monetary transaction and she had issued the afore-said cheque at the instance of her husband, i.e. her co-accused and therefore, she deserves the relief as prayed for in this petition.

Per contra, learned State counsel argues that the petitioner had actively participated in the crime by alluring the complainant to invest the money with them and besides the complainant, she and her afore-named co-accused have duped many other persons of their hard-earned money and keeping in view the gravity of the offence committed by her, this petition be dismissed.

The complainant has categorically alleged in the FIR that the petitioner and her husband were well aware of the factum of the sale of the land of his (complainant's) mother and their having sufficient funds on this

count and they both had induced him to pay Rs.15 lacs to them on the pretext of their having been facing some financial hardship in their business and promised that they would repay the said amount along-with interest and therefore, he had given the cheque worth Rs.3 lacs to both of them and the remaining amount was paid through the bank transaction and that the above-said cheque, as issued by the petitioner, had been dishonoured by the concerned Bank. It has also been specifically mentioned in the Status-Report that besides the complainant, the petitioner and her husband had duped several other persons by alluring them to invest their money with them on the pretext that they would be earning high profits for the same.

Keeping in view the above-discussed facts and circumstances as well as the gravity of the offence as alleged to have been committed by the petitioner, this Court is of the considered opinion that she (petitioner) does not deserve the relief of anticipatory bail.

Resultantly, the petition in hand stands dismissed.

February 24, 2022
Yag Dutt

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes*

Whether Reportable: *No*