

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

**CRM-M-46426-2022**

**Date of Decision: October 11, 2022**

**Saloni**

**...Petitioner**

**Versus**

**State of Punjab**

**...Respondent**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY**

**Present:-** Mr. B.S. Bali, Advocate for the petitioner.

**AMAN CHAUDHARY, J.(Oral)**

The present petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.159, dated 23.09.2021, under Sections 406, 420, 120-B of the Indian Penal Code and Section 13 of the Punjab Travel Professional Act, 2014, registered at Police Station Nakodar City, District Jalandhar.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is a government employee and has no concern with the transactions that took place between the complainant and her husband and other co-accused. He further submits that the amount is stated to be received by other co-accused not the petitioner that there is no other specific allegation against the petitioner and has been involved only being wife of the co-accused Prithpal Singh .

Notice of motion.

At the asking of the Court, Mr. Manipal Singh Atwal, DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

Learned State counsel has brought to the notice of this Court the fact that there are specific allegations against the petitioner in the FIR for having received an amount of Rs.1,00,000/- in cash from the

complainant and Rs.50,000/- by way of a cheque that got encashed on 04.12.2019. He further submits that the total amount received by the petitioner along with other co-accused is Rs.6,00,500/-. He further submits that the petitioner and her husband were the one, who had introduced the complainant to co-accused Neeraj Atter and Rajni Atter. It is his further submission that there are three other FIRs lodged against the petitioner, which further fortifies the fact that the petitioner is very much connected to the transactions and the business of travel agency and is working along with other co-accused in connivance with each other. Co-accused, namely, Rajni Atter, had also filed CRM-M-4632-2022, which when the Court was not inclined to entertain, was withdrawn by her counsel. He further submits that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required in order to ascertain the modus operandi and also fact that innocent persons are duped by her on the pretext of sending them abroad. In such circumstances, he submits that the present petition deserves to be dismissed.

Having heard the respective submissions made on behalf of the parties and keeping in view the fact that the petitioner has received the amount from the complainant on the pretext of sending him abroad and her custodial interrogation is required, there is no ground to grant concession of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner.

Accordingly, the petition is dismissed.

**October 11, 2022**  
sarita

**(AMAN CHAUDHARY)**  
**JUDGE**

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