



103 (1)

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

CRM-M-10696-2024(O&M)

Date of decision: 08.05.2024

Pavneet Bajwa @ Neetu

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU

Present: Mr. Ajay Kripal Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Kiran Pal Singh, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Abhinav Singh, Advocate for the complainant.

MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU, J.

Present first petition has been filed under Section 438 of Cr.P.C. for grant of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 29 dated 10.02.2024, under Sections 406, 420 of Indian Penal Code (for short 'IPC') and Section 24 of The Emigration Act, 1983, registered at Police Station Matlauda, District Panipat.

(2) Above FIR was registered on the basis of statement made by complainant-Anand Singh with the allegations that petitioner alongwith co-accused duped complainant to the tune of Rs. 73,50,000/- on the pretext of sending his son to USA.

(3) Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that she has been falsely implicated in the present case. Further contends that petitioner is working as Principal in a school situated at Sector 12, Karnal and she has nothing to do with the business of her husband-co-accused-Ranjeet Singh. Also contends that in pursuance of order dated 06.03.2024, petitioner has joined investigation and as such, custodial interrogation would not serve any purpose.

(4) *Per contra*, learned State counsel on instructions submitted that petitioner and her co-accused duped complainant to the tune of Rs. 73,50,000/- on



the pretext of sending his son to USA. Further submitted that although petitioner joined investigation, but she is not co-operating and recovery of alleged amount of Rs. 73,50,000/- as well as other documents are yet to be effected.

(5) Learned counsel for the complainant contended that he had sold his agriculture land in order to pay Rs.73,50,000/- to the petitioner as well as co-accused, but they failed to honour the commitment and misappropriated the amount.

(6) Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the paper book.

(7) Allegations are that petitioner alongwith co-accused defrauded complainant and duped him to the tune of Rs.73,50,000/- on the pretext of sending his son to USA. Also transpires that in order to discharge the liability, co-accused (Ranjeet Singh) issued two cheques for an amount of Rs. 60 lakhs and Rs. 10 lakhs, respectively; but both the cheques were dishonoured. The recovery of alleged amount alongwith PAN Card, Aadhar Card and Family ID of the complainant are yet to be effected. Therefore, in such a scenario, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is the only way out.

(8) In view of the above, this Court is not inclined to grant pre-arrest bail to the petitioner.

(9) Consequently, petition is dismissed.

(10.) Interim protection granted by this Court on 06.03.2024 shall come to an end, automatically.

(11) The observations made above be not construed as an expression of opinion on merits of the case; rather confined only to decide the present petition.

(12) Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

08.05.2024
Harish Kumar

(MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No