



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-46303-2024
Date of Decision:- 07.11.2024

TEJINDER KAUR ...Petitioner

Vs.

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER ...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI

Present:- Mr. Manish Verma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Nikhil K. Vashishtha, Advocate for complainant.

AMARJOT BHATTI, J.

1. Petitioner has filed instant petition under Section 438 of Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.196 dated 04.08.2021 under Sections 420, 408, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B IPC registered at Police Station Division No.6, District Police Commissionerate, Ludhiana.
2. As per facts of the case, Jagraj Singh filed written complaint alleging that he is running M/s Indian Securities Services (Registered) Sandhu Building, Dholewal Chowk, Ludhiana in which Rajvinder Singh was working as Field Officer for the last several years. His job was to take payment by cheque from the clients and to deposit the same in the office. He was to collect record of attendance and was to give salary to the security workers. Later-on, he came to know about the fraud committed by him and noticed discrepancy in bills and payment of salary to the parties as

well as discrepancy in filing income tax returns. On enquiry, he came to know about various irregularities committed by the petitioner, thus misappropriated huge amount of the company. With these allegations, present FIR was registered.

3. Learned counsel for petitioner pointed out that earlier he was granted anticipatory bail with the direction to surrender before the trial Court within 15 days with further direction to the trial Court to dispose of her bail application at the earliest possible time preferably within three days. Copy of said order is Annexure P-7. Learned counsel for petitioner conceded that he did not comply the said direction, however, effected compromise with the complainant which is Annexure P-4. Now there is no dispute between them that he is ready to join investigation and abide by the terms of bail order.

4. Learned counsel representing complainant confirmed the aforesaid factual position. However, bail application is opposed by learned counsel representing State taking the stand that petitioner did not obey the terms and conditions detailed in order dated 17.05.2024. Investigating agency is not aware of the compromise. Till date petitioner has not joined the investigation.

5. I have considered the aforesaid factual position. It is rightly pointed out that petitioner did not comply the order dated 17.05.2024 but at the same time it cannot be ignored that now matter is settled with the complainant and they have resolved their dispute. Petitioner is ready to join the investigation as and when required. No purpose would be served by sending her behind the bars. Therefore, taking lenient view, anticipatory

bail filed by petitioner is allowed. In case petitioner is arrested, she be released on bail to the satisfaction of Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer subject to the condition that petitioner will join investigation as and when required. She will not tamper with or interfere with the investigation and will not leave the country without prior permission as provided under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.

6. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stand disposed of accordingly.

(AMARJOT BHATTI)
JUDGE

07.11.2024

snd

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No.

Whether reportable: Yes/No