

CRM-M-41433-2021

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

CRM-M-41433-2021

Date of decision: 19.01.2022

Anjali Thakur

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Gurpreet Singh Dhillon, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Saurav Khurana, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Varun Sharma, Advocate,
for the complainant.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

Case is taken up for hearing through video conferencing.

Through this second petition, the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.17 dated 01.02.2021, registered at Police Station Dasuya, District Hoshiarpur, under Sections 420, 506 and 120-B IPC.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is wife of co-accused, Sanjeev Thakur @ Sanjay Thakur, who stood arrested on 07.12.2021; that even co-accused, Vajinder Kumar, who got effected recovery of Rs.9,50,000/-, also stood arrested, and that even as per the status report dated 21.12.2021 filed in connected case i.e. CRM-M-41398-2021, it was found during investigation that the petitioner had no role to play in the commission of the alleged offences.

On the other hand, learned counsel for the complainant does

CRM-M-41433-2021

not dispute the aforesaid stand taken by the prosecution in the status report with regard to the role of the petitioner.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

Keeping in view the stand taken by the prosecution that the petitioner has no role to play in the alleged offences; but without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this Court finds that the petitioner is not required for custodial interrogation and no useful purpose would be served by sending the petitioner behind the bars. Therefore, finding merit in the present petition, the same is allowed. The petitioner is directed to join investigation as and when called upon to do so and if she is sought to be arrested, she shall be released on anticipatory bail to the satisfaction of Investigating Officer/Arresting Officer, subject to the conditions as envisaged in Section 438 (2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

It is made clear that if pursuant to and in compliance with this order, the petitioner does not cooperate with the investigating agency, the investigating agency would be liberty to move an appropriate application for cancellation of bail.

19.01.2022

parveen kumar

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?

Yes/No

Whether reportable?

Yes/No