



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

103

**CRM-M-41964-2024
Decided on : 29.08.2024**

GEETA DEVI

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE KIRTI SINGH

PRESENT: Mr. Sushil Sheoran, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Gaurav Bansal, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Sunil Chaudhary, Advocate for complainant.
(Through video conferencing).

KIRTI SINGH, J. (Oral)

Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, in case FIR No.196 dated 14.08.2024, under Sections 406/420 IPC registered at Police Station Industrial Area Bhiwani, District Bhiwani.

2. The brief facts of the case are that on 11.07.2024, a complaint was received in the office of Superintendent of Police, Bhiwani for taking action against accused Geeta @ Sunita (SHO) wife of Dalbir, resident of Bhiwani, mentioning therein that in the month of November, 2023, he met with accused Geeta @ Sunita for the first time, who told him that she is serving in Haryana Police and posted as SHO. She also disclosed that she used to visit courts and was well known to judicial officers and she could get any case decided as per her wishes and she can also secure a job for any person in judicial department. Since his son Harsh @ Golu was matriculate and unemployed, he asked her to get a job for his son in the court. He disclosed all this to one Bhim Singh, who belonged to his village and he also informed his relatives. Geeta (applicant) had demanded Rs.4,00,000/- per candidate for getting job in courts. In the month of December, 2023, he gave Rs.2,00,000/- to her to get a job for his son. In total 5-6 times, for getting job to five persons, he gave Rs.18,65,000/- in which Rs.2,00,000/- cash for



Harsh @ Golu, Rs.4,00,000/- cash for Mukesh, Rs.4,00,000/- cash for Deepak, Rs.4,00,000/- cash for Virender and Rs.4,00,000/- cash for Deepak. In the month of January, 2024, she demanded photocopies of class 10th and 12th certificates, 4 passport size photos of each and Rs.8,000/- per person for abovesaid boys for their medical. In this way, she received Rs.40,000/- for medical certificates from them. In the last week of January, 2024 she asked to borrow Rs.25,000/- and promised to return in next month. In this way, she received Rs.18,40,000/- cash for abovesaid 5 persons for getting job in Courts. Thereafter, she also received two cancelled cheques for securing a job from each of the candidates and stated that his son has been appointed in Sessions Judge Court and other 04 boys were to be appointed in Dadri and Hisar Courts respectively. She stated that she had talked to a Judge Ritu Gupta and her Reader who told her that all will be provided a job within 5-10 days. She further told him that after the election and counting on 5th June, she would handover the appointment letters to them. After that, the accused also handed over two cheques of Rs.10,00,000/- each of HDFC bank vide cheque no.000005 and 000004 to him as security. The complainant used mobile No.86850-70599, his nephew (Bhanja) used mobile No.70277-88908 and Bhim Singh used mobile No.97291-60244 and they had conversations with accused for about seven months. One video recording and call recording are with him in his mobile phone. In this way, the accused has received a sum of Rs.18,65,000/- from them for securing a job and thus cheated them. Complainant prayed for taking appropriate action against the accused. On the basis of abovesaid application, present FIR under Sections 406 and 420 of the IPC was registered.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case and no offence has been made out against the petitioner. As per the version of FIR, the petitioner had given a cheque in lieu of the amount received by her and the cheque amount is more than the amount allegedly given by the complainant to the petitioner. Thus, no amount is due against the petitioner and the complainant has a remedy to file a complaint under Section 138 of Negotiable Instruments Act.

4. Notice of motion.

5. On advance notice, Mr. Gaurav Bansal, DAG, Haryana, who is present in Court submits that there are serious allegations levelled against



the petitioner and therefore, she is not entitled for the concession of anticipatory bail.

- 6. Heard the rival submissions made by both the parties.
- 7. The allegations against the accused person is that an amount of Rs.18,65,000/- has been taken from five people on the pretext of getting them jobs in Courts and the investigation of the case is still in progress.
- 8. In view of the above, without adverting anything on the merits of the case, this Court is of the considered opinion that in order to unearth the true dimensions of the alleged crime, the police requires custodial interrogation of the petitioner in this case. Hence, the petitioner is not entitled for the concession of anticipatory bail and, accordingly, the petition is **dismissed**.

(KIRTI SINGH)
JUDGE

29.08.2024
Kavita

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