

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

205

CRM-M-27347-2023**Date of decision: 10.10.2023**

Veena Rani

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

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

Present : Mr. Prince Goyal, Advocate
for the petitioner

Mr. Jagdish Manchanda, Addl. AG, Haryana

Mr. Imaan Singh, Advocate
for the complainant

***********AMAN CHAUDHARY. J.**

1. On 05.06.2023, this Court had passed the following order:-

“The instant petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C., has been filed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.0231, dated 11.09.2022, under Section 420 of IPC, 1860, registered at Police Station Civil Lines Bathinda, District Bathinda.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the Economic Offences Wing of the police has already conducted an inquiry and found the petitioner to be innocent, as no transaction of money on the part of the petitioner could be found and neither any conversation took place between the complainant and the petitioner. It is also the assertion of the petitioner that merely on account of the fact that the husband of the petitioner is the main accused, her name has been dragged in the instant FIR.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of Court, Mr. Mohit Chaudhary, AAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State, who on instructions from ASI Charanjit Singh, opposes the prayer made in the instant petition stating that the petitioner in connivance with her husband has duped the innocent people, wherein more than Rs. 5,52,000/- stands received by them.

It is also brought to the notice of this Court that accused-petitioner is time and again changing the residential premises just to evade the persons, who are asking for their money to be refunded.

Be that as it may, looking into the facts and circumstances involved in the case, wherein admittedly the husband of the petitioner is the main accused and no direct attribution along with incriminating material has come forth in the FIR or has been put forth by learned State counsel, the petitioner is directed to be released on interim bail in case he joins the investigation on furnishing personal surety/security bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer. The petitioner will also come present as and when called for and cooperate in investigation and shall abide by the conditions as envisaged under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.

Adjourned to 10.10.2023. ”

2. Learned counsel submits that in pursuance of the above order, the petitioner has not only joined investigation, but also fully cooperated with the investigating agency. He further submits that in case the investigating agency requires the petitioner to appear, she shall make herself available without demur.

3. Learned State counsel on instructions affirms the factum of joining the investigation by the petitioner and cooperating with the investigating agency. He also submits that at this stage, the petitioner is not required for further custodial interrogation.

4. In view of the above and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, anticipatory bail petition filed by the petitioner is allowed and the order dated 02.08.2023 granting interim bail to her, is hereby made absolute, subject to compliance of conditions as specified under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

5. However, it is made clear that if the petitioner fails to join and cooperate with the investigating agency as and when required, the State would be at liberty to move an application for cancellation of the present anticipatory bail granted to her.

10.10.2023
Mehak

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

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