

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

214

CRM-M-43541-2023

Date of decision: 09.01.2024

Jashuda Seth

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. Angad Parmar, Advocate for
Mr. Vivek K. Thakur, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Arun Luthra, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. D.K. Singal, Advocate
for the complainant.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail under Section 438 of the Cr.P.C. in case FIR No.121 dated 14.06.2023 under Sections 420/120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station Ajnala, District Amritsar.

2. On 01.09.2023, learned counsel for the petition had made the following submissions:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, submits that even a perusal of the FIR in question reveals that there was no specific allegation levelled against the petitioner with respect to the commission of fraud allegedly committed with the bank, where she was working as its Operation Manager. Learned counsel submits that admittedly some gold loan was sanctioned, however, the purity of the gold against which the alleged loan was sanctioned was to be checked by a valuer appointed by the bank itself.”

3. Thereafter, on 12.10.2023, while noticing the following

submissions made by learned State counsel, the petitioner was granted interim bail and had been asked to join investigation:-

“Learned State counsel has submitted, on instructions, that the petitioner was the Deputy Manager of the Bank. He submits that though a valuer had been engaged by the Bank to assess the gold against which the people obtained loan, however, being the Deputy Manager, he was also morally responsible for monitoring the operations of the Branch where he was posted.”

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of order dated 12.10.2023, the petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.

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

6. In view of the above, the petition is allowed and interim order dated 12.10.2023, is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

09.01.2024

Vinay

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

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