

MONIKA RANI
2024.12.04 16:34
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this order

5:34 They gave assurance that their money will be safe with them. The



complainant has given details of Committees in which he participated from time to time along with his brother Satinder Kumar. Aforesaid accused persons used to receive money and in return they issued fake receipts. Initially, they used to pay back some money but later on when their circle expanded, they started cheating which was their intention from the very beginning. With these allegations, present FIR has been registered.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that petitioner is 28 years old lady having a minor son. She has nothing to do in the said chit fund. The complainant has falsely implicated her being a lady of the house. No specific role is attributed to her nor any amount was received by her. This is first FIR registered against her. She will abide by the terms of bail order, therefore, she may be released on anticipatory bail.

4. Bail application is opposed by learned counsel representing State. Detailed status report has been filed. Learned counsel representing State pointed out that apart from the present complaint during ongoing investigation, 27 other persons lodged complaints with the Investigating Officer levelling similar allegations against the accused persons. All the accused are members of the same family and they started running the business of committee to trap innocent people and misappropriated their hard earned money. In the status report, there is detail of 28 persons along with amount regarding which fraud has been committed by the petitioner and other co-accused and the total amount comes out to be Rs.1,97,85,000/-. Co-accused Ramandeep Singh could not be arrested and he is absconding. Present petitioner is specifically named who received money from different persons. She is required to join the investigation, therefore she is not entitled to be released on anticipatory bail.

5. I have considered the arguments. Present petitioner is named in the FIR. Specific role is attributed to her. The age of petitioner is mentioned as 41 years in the memo of parties whereas in the first para of the petition her age is mentioned as 28 years. This Court is not much concerned with the gender or age of petitioner. The allegations which are detailed in the FIR and further cropped up during investigation are serious. Status report reveals that it is not only the complainant who has been cheated but apart from him there are other complaints received against the accused persons and huge amount is involved as detailed in the status report.

6. Considering the gravity of offence, custodial interrogation is required, therefore, I do not find it a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail and the same is accordingly declined.

(AMARJOT BHATTI)
JUDGE

03.12.2024
monika

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|---------|
| 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned | : | Yes /No |
| 2. Whether reportable | : | Yes /No |