



105 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-7869-2025

Date of Decision: 11.02.2025

RENU YADAV

...Petitioner

Vs.

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Samir Rathaur, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. B.S. Virk, Senior DAG, Haryana.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J. (Oral)

1. **Relief sought**

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.699 dated 30.10.2023, under Sections 120-B, 409, 420, 467, 468, 471 of Indian Penal Code, registered at Police Station Sadar Gurugram, District Gurugram, Haryana.

2. Prosecution story setup in the present case as per the version in the FIR as under:-

*Tele (0124)-4004207 Email: echspoluclinic49@gmail.com
35/Misc/ECGS/SR04 Aug 2023 ECGS Polyclinic Gurgaon (Sohna Rd) Community Center II Sispal Vihar (AWHO) Sector 47, Gurgaon (Haryana) Pin 122018 Police Station Sadar Thana, Gurgaon. FIR WITH RESPECT TO GRADULENT ACTIVITY AT ECHS POLYCLINIC SOHNA ROAD, GURUGRAM. 1. IT is informed that Mr Naresh Kumar Dauchania, Address H. No. 24A, Maharani Enclave Hastal Village, West Delhi-110059 was employed as billing clerk at ECHS Polyclinic, Sohna Road with effect from 20 Oct 2021. He was responsible for the billing section (to accept and process In-patient Department Claims, Home*



isolation claims and putting claims ID on NA Bills) 2. Mr Naresh Kumar Dauchania Billing Clerk had processed Medical reimbursement bills during that period which were forced, digitally signed them on behalf of the then Officer incharge ECHS Polyclinic Sohna Road Wing Commander Jai Prakash (Retd) and forwarded to the Bill Paying Agency and Regional Centre ECHS-I and reported to ECHS Polyclinic Sohna Road who in turn reported the same to ECHS Cell, Station Headquarter Delhi Cantt. 3. The list of claims processed is attached at appendix to this letter 4. Some claims were detected as fraudulent and stopped but some claims were paid. An amount of Rs.28,42,690/- (Twenty Eight Lakh Forty Two Thousand and Six Hundred Ninety only) was claimed and credited to the account of two accomplices Ms. Raveena Kumari C/o Mr Naresh Kumar Dauchania, H. No.-24 A, Maharani Enclave, Uttam Nagar, New Delhi 110059 and Ms Renu Yadav, H No-24A, Maharani Enclave, Uttam Nagar, New Delhi-110059. Details of account numbers are given at appendix 5. Once the case was detected and the individual was questioned, he agreed to his actions and voluntarily gave a statement for the same. Copy of his statement is also enclosed. 6. In view of the above you are requested to kindly lodge an FIR against the three individuals and process the case according to the law of the land. Sd/- Col. KK Sharma (Retd) OIC ECHS Polyclinic Gurgaon (Sohna Road). Above complaint was received at police station with approval for registration of the case. From details of FIR and the investigation of ASI Pravinder 240 offence under sections 409, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC is found to have been committed and above-mentioned FIR under above-mentioned sections is registered, and upon checking and freezing of FIR by the Duty Officer prints were taken. The same are being sent to the higher officers through post. Original writing and original file are retained by me ASI for further investigation. This FIR is being registered in the presence of ASI Pravinder. IO-ASI Pravinder 240, Police Station Sadar Gurugram.

3. **Contention**

On behalf of the petitioner

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner



has been falsely implicated in the present case as the bogus bills prepared by the prime accused Naresh Kumar Dauchania got credited to the bank account of the petitioner, as the petitioner has fiduciary relation with and under the same pretext he gained access of bank account of the petitioner and used it for various credit and debit transactions. He further submits that the investigation in the present case is going on for last more than 01 year and 02 months and all the relevant documents are in possession of police authorities. He further submits that the petitioner has already lost her job with the ECHS Polyclinic.

On behalf of the State

Learned State Counsel appearing on advance notice, on instructions from the Investigating Officer, did not oppose the instant petition since the investigation in the present case is complete and all the documentary material is in the possession of the police authorities and the her custodial interrogation is not required.

4. **Analysis**

Be that as it may, after giving a thoughtful consideration to the submissions as made by counsel for the parties and considering the fact that no fruitful purpose would be served by sending the accused behind the bars, as the petitioner has fully cooperated with the investigation and all the documentary evidence is in the possession of police authorities, as such, this Court finds no reason to deny the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner as she is ready and willing to join the investigation to cooperate with the investigating officer for furtherance of the investigation.



5. **Decision**

In the light of above, the petitioner is hereby directed to be released on anticipatory bail subject to her joining investigation with the Investigating Officer concerned within a period of one week from today, on furnishing of personal/surety bonds to his satisfaction. The petitioner shall also abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS, which are reproduced below:-

“When the High Court or the Court of Session makes a direction under sub-section (1), it may include such conditions in such directions in the light of the facts of the particular case, as it may think fit, including-

(i) a condition that the person shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;

(ii) a condition that the person shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;

(iii) a condition that the person shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court;

(iv) such other condition as may be imposed under sub-section (3) of section 480, as if the bail were granted under that section.”

However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner does not comply with the aforesaid direction of joining the investigation within one week, the order passed by this Court today shall automatically stands cancelled.

In the aforesaid terms, the present petition stands disposed off.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

11.02.2025

kv

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