



In The High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
At Chandigarh

CRM-M-56980-2024 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 03.12.2024

Raman Kumari ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Suram Singh Rana, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Prabhdeep Singh Dhaliwal, AAG, Punjab.

FIR NO.	DATE	POLICE STATION	OFFENCES
90	29.06.2024	Mullanpur, SAS Nagar, Mohali	406, 420, 120-B IPC

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J.

1. The instant petition has been filed on behalf of the petitioner seeking grant of anticipatory bail in respect of aforementioned FIR.
2. The FIR was lodged by Hardeep Singh wherein it is alleged that he had been duped an amount of Rs.40 lakhs by the accused on the pretext of providing a job of Peon to complainant and to



complainant's brother and also to get employed complainant's wife as Clerk in the Office of MC, Chandigarh. It is alleged that accused Vikram Padam impersonated as a Clerk, working in the Office of MC and introduced a lady as Commissioner of MC, who in fact was none else but his wife Raman Kumari. The said two persons were introduced to the complainant by his neighbour Sahil Giki. It is alleged that the complainant being taken in by the representation made by the accused parted with an amount of Rs.22 lakhs. It is alleged that the accused handed over appointment letters dated 28.6.2022 in the name of complainant and his brother and also in the name of Karamjit Kaur wife of Hardeep Singh, but in fact the said appointment letters were later found to be forged. It is further the case of prosecution that accused in fact made Hardeep Singh and Karamjit Kaur join in the Office of MC where Vikram Padam described about their duties and got distributed official mail while convincing them about their appointment. It is further the case of prosecution that Vikram Padam also deposited an amount of Rs.15,000/- in the account of the complainant representing the same to be his salary. It is further the case of prosecution that while an amount of Rs.6 lakhs each was paid for appointment of the complainant and his brother as Peon, another amount of Rs.10 lakhs was paid for appointment of complainant's wife as a Clerk and thus a total of Rs.22 lakhs was paid by them and that some of their relatives were also cheated in identical manner.



3. Status report by way of affidavit of Mr. Mohit Kumar Agarwal, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub Division Kharar-2, District SAS Nagar has been filed. The same is taken on record. A copy of the short reply has been furnished to learned counsel opposite.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that she has falsely been implicated in the present case and that there is no evidence to show that she had ever received any amount from the complainant or from anybody else. It has been submitted that although the police claims to have collected some evidence in the shape of video footage, but the said video recording only shows accused Vikram Padam to be receiving money from the complainant and that the petitioner is not shown anywhere in the said footage.
5. Opposing the petition, learned State counsel submitted that it is a well orchestrated crime executed by the petitioner and her husband on account of which complainant and other innocent persons had been duped of an amount of Rs.40 lakhs. Learned State counsel submitted that as a matter of fact a video recording has been collected which clearly shows Vikram Padam co-accused receiving money from the complainant and that the allegations virtually stands substantiated and that the petitioner even if not shown in the video cannot plead innocence and the petitioner at this stage does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.
6. This Court has considered rival submissions addressed before this Court.



7. Having regard to the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, and also the fact that the petitioner has been specifically named in the FIR along with her husband and that innocent persons had been duped of huge amount of Rs.40 lakhs and the finer details of the entire racket are yet to be unearthed, no special case for grant of anticipatory bail is made out.
8. Finding no merit in the instant petition and the same is hereby dismissed.

03.12.2024
mohan

(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

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