

217

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-36318-2024 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 18.09.2024

AMITA ALIAS AMITA GOYAL

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present : Mr. P.S. Ahluwalia, Advocate and
Mr. Deepinder Singh Virk, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ankit Grewal, DAG Punjab.

SANJIV BERRY, J. (ORAL)

By way of present petition filed under Section 438 CrPC,
petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR (Annexure P-1) as under:

FIR No.	Dated	Sections	Police Station
46	08.06.2024	406, 420, 465, 468, 471, 120-B IPC	Julkan, District Patiala

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that in compliance to the order dated 29.08.2024 passed by this Court, the petitioner has already joined the investigation and as such interim bail granted to the petitioner may be confirmed.
3. Learned State counsel, on instructions received from the Investigating Officer has intimated that the petitioner has joined investigation and is no more required for any custodial investigation in this



case nor she is required for further investigation.

4. Heard.

5. During the course of hearing on 29.08.2024, the following order was passed:-

“ 2. It is, inter alia, contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has no concern whatsoever with the alleged transactions which, in fact, was carried out by the firm M/s Travel Hub, which happens to be the sole proprietorship firm of Chetan Goyal. The petitioner happens to be mother of said Chetan Goyal. The alleged transactions happen to be between Chetan Goyal and the complainant and even in the agreement dated 08.06.2023 mentioned in the reply submitted by the State, the petitioner is not party or signatory and the petitioner is not beneficiary of the alleged transactions.

3. Learned State counsel, on instructions received from ASI Gurbinder Singh, Investigating Officer of the case, has shown the agreement dated 08.06.2023. The perusal whereof would reveal that the petitioner is not signatory thereto. The Investigating Officer present in Court has not been able to present any document to show the petitioner as beneficiary of alleged transaction or how the petitioner has any concern with the firm M/s Travel Hub.

4. List on 18.09.2024.

5. In the meanwhile, without commenting on the merits of the case at this stage, it is deemed appropriate that the petitioner should join investigation before deciding the petition on merits. Accordingly, the petitioner is directed to join investigation within seven days from today and in the event of her arrest, she is ordered to be released on interim bail on her furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer. She shall also abide by conditions as envisaged under Section 482 (2) of BNSS, 2023. ”

6. Keeping in view the above submissions made by learned State counsel and the fact that the petitioner had joined the investigation consequent to the order dated 29.08.2024 passed by this Court, interim bail granted vide order dated 29.08.2024 is hereby confirmed, subject to conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) BNSS. Further the petitioner



is directed to join investigation as and when required in future by way of written notice for such purpose to be served by Investigating Officer of this case upon the petitioner; she will not tamper with the evidence nor will influence the witnesses and will not leave the country without prior permission of the Court.

7. The petition stands allowed.

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

18.09.2024

S.Sharma(syr)

i)	Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
ii)	Whether reportable?	Yes/No