

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-35634-2021 (O&M)
Date of decision: 25.04.2022

Rajni Pandey
...Petitioner(s)
Versus
Union Territory of Chandigarh & another
...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present:- Mr. Keshav Pratap Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Abhinav Gupta, APP, UT, Chandigarh.

Mr. D.V. Sharma, Sr. Advocate with
Ms. Pooja Yadav, Advocate
for respondent no.2.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
196	27.7.2021	Sector 39, District Chandigarh	409, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC

1. The petitioner apprehending arrest in the FIR captioned above has come up before this Court under Section 438 CrPC seeking anticipatory bail.
2. In paragraph 11 of the bail petition, the accused declares that she has no criminal antecedents.
3. In a nutshell, the allegations against the petitioner are that taking advantage of her posting as an accountant, forged and fabricated bills, opened an account in the name of Outlook Express, spent the money on purchasing luxury items, and also transferred massive amounts in the accounts of her accomplices as well as her account.
4. Ld. Counsel for the petitioner contends that the custodial investigation would serve no purpose whatsoever, and the pre-trial incarceration would cause an irreversible injustice to the petitioner and family.

5. Ld. counsel representing the State opposes bail. The contention of behalf of the complainant is that the petitioner is not entitled to any bail.

REASONING:

6. Learned APP appearing for UT Chandigarh has drawn attention of this Court to the bank statement of account held by the petitioner in Yes Bank, which shows that apart from other transactions, on 24.10.2019, a sum of Rs.12,00,000/- was transferred from the account of Outlook Express to the account of the petitioner-Rajni Pandey. Documents further reveal that she was the one who had opened Outlook Express account and her signatures were there.

7. An analysis of the allegations and evidence collected does not warrant grant of bail to the petitioner.

8. Without commenting on the case's merits, in the facts and circumstances peculiar to this case, and for the reasons mentioned above, the petitioner fails to make a case for bail at this stage.

9. Any observation made hereinabove is neither an expression of opinion on the merits of the case nor shall the trial Court advert to these comments.

Petition dismissed in aforesaid terms. All interim orders granting bail stand vacated.

All pending applications, if any, stand disposed.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

April 25, 2022
AK

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes
Whether reportable:	No.