

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

105

CRM-M-25959-2024 (O&M)

Date of Decision : October 22, 2024

AARTI SINDHU @ SONIA

-PETITIONER

V/S

STATE OF HARYANA

-RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. Vikram Rana, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajesh Gaur, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

Mr. A.K. Ranolia, Advocate
for the respondent No.2.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (ORAL)

1. Through the instant petition, the petitioner has sought the concession of anticipatory bail, in case FIR No.122 dated 06.02.2024, under Sections 420/406/120-B/506 of the IPC, registered at P.S. City Yamuna Nagar, District Yamuna Nagar.

2. Succinctly stated, the allegations levelled in the present FIR are that, the petitioner and his co-accused have duped the complainant for approx. ₹ 8,90,000/-, on the pretext of sending him abroad. After obtaining money from the complainant, through bank transactions and/or cash, the petitioner and his co-accused neither arranged visa for him, nor returned his amount. Moreover, the cheque of ₹ 7,00,000/-, which was issued by the petitioner to return the complainant's money, was also dishonoured on account of "insufficient funds".

3. For the reasons to be assigned hereinafter, coupled with the

mala fide conduct of the petitioner, as becomes discussed hereinafter, this Court is not inclined to grant the extraordinary relief of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, out of ₹ 8,90,000/-, the petitioner has already returned an amount of ₹ 4,00,000/- to the complainant. However, there is no documentary evidence available on record to substantiate this submission.

5. Moreover, consequent upon the petitioner getting the relief of interim bail from a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court on 12.06.2024, although she expressed her readiness and willingness to explore the possibilities of a settlement, whereupon, the parties were referred to the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court, however, the mediation proceedings could not reap any fruits, inasmuch as, the petitioner did not cause appearance before the mediator. Such conduct of the petitioner resulted in a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court, vide order dated 30.08.2024, vacating the interim protection (*supra*) granted to the petitioner.

6. Not only this, when the instant petition came up for hearing before this Court on 01.10.2024, although the petitioner again expressed her readiness and willingness to deposit ₹ 5,00,000/-, in the shape of demand draft, with the investigating officer concerned, however, she did not act in compliance of her readiness and willingness (*supra*), inasmuch as, on 14.10.2024, the learned State counsel informed this Court that the petitioner did not deposit the amount of ₹ 5,00,000/-.

7. Taking into account the gravity of the allegations, as also the *mala fide* conduct of the petitioner that, time and again, she made false submissions before this Court, the petitioner is not entitled for the relief of anticipatory bail. Consequently, the instant petition is **dismissed**.
8. Pending application(s) stand disposed of accordingly.

October 22, 2024	(KULDEEP TIWARI)
devinder	JUDGE
Whether speaking/reasoned	: Yes/No
Whether Reportable	: Yes/No