

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

214

2023:PHHC:110829

CRM-M-28550-2023

Date of decision: August 24th, 2023

Paramjit

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Parveen Sharma, Advocate
for Mr. Davinder Kumar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Trishanjali Sharma, Deputy Advocate General,
Haryana.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail in FIR No.131 dated 13.03.2023 for the offences under Sections 406, 420 IPC registered at Police Station Krishna Gate Thanewar, District Kurukshetra (Annexure P-1).

Mr. Rajesh Bansal, Advocate, has filed power of attorney on behalf of the complainant, which is taken on record.

Vide order dated 01.06.2023, the petitioner had been granted interim anticipatory bail with direction to join investigation and the relevant part of the said order reads as under:-

“Learned counsel inter alia contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case in hand, only on account of the fact that she was wife of co-accused Angrej Singh, who allegedly lured the complainant to part with a sum of ₹ 7.00 lacs on the pretext of sending the complainant and his wife to USA. Learned counsel submits that the petitioner has clean antecedents and is not involved in any other criminal case, much less a case of similar nature.”

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of order dated 01.06.2023, the petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Sunil Kumar, does not dispute the factum of the petitioner having joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency. She, on further instructions submits that the petitioner is not required for further investigation much less for her custodial interrogation.

On a pointed query put to learned State counsel qua the antecedents of the petitioner, she on instructions, has informed that the petitioner is not involved in any other criminal case. However, learned counsel appearing for the complainant has disputed the instructions received by the learned State counsel. He submits that as per instructions received by him, the petitioner is involved in another criminal case.

In view of the above, the petition is allowed and interim order dated 01.06.2023, is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C. Needless to say, in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail granted to her, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of the same.

August 24th, 2023
Puneet

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No