



217

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

CRM-M-11914-2025

Date of decision : 07.03.2025

Pooja Rani**.....Petitioner****versus****State of Haryana****..... Respondent****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ**

Present :- Mr. Anil Mehta, Advocate with
Mr. Nishant Indal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vijesh Sharma, Addl. A.G., Haryana assisted by
SI Vinay Kumar.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Petitioner has approached this Court by way of present petition praying for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.64 dated 07.03.2024, under Sections 384 and 120-B of IPC and later on added Section 420 IPC registered at Police Station Sadar Pehowa, District Kurukshetra. Further prayer has been made for setting aside the order dated 23.10.2024, whereby the Additional Sessions Judge, Kurukshetra has dismissed the bail application of the petitioner.

2. Succinctly the facts of the case are that the FIR in the present case was lodged on the statement of Amrik Singh. It was alleged that his daughter-in-law, namely, Suman had sold her ancestral land which was in her name and from that money she purchased another property in Pehowa. Out of the amount received by selling the land around Rs.59-60 lacs was left with her. Same was deposited in joint account of his daughter-in-law and son, namely, Sarvjit Singh in Punjab National Bank, Pehowa. On 17.06.2023, his son and daughter-in-law went to Ambala city to purchase



some property and took Rs.10 lacs in cash with them. Then at around 11.30 am, four persons came to their house and told them that they were CBI officials and also said that they had credible information that they have sold government land in Punjab and therefore, duped the government with lakhs of rupees. The complainant, honestly believed them that they were CBI officials and thus, they were threatened and under the threat they were posing themselves as CBI officials, they took Rs.10 lacs which were kept in the bag of his son. Thereafter another Rs.10 lacs were withdrawn from the account of his son and daughter-in-law and by threatening, they got RTGS done for Rs.21 lacs. It was thus, alleged that by posing as CBI officials, accused duped the complainant for an amount of Rs.52 lacs. The request was made to take the legal action against the culprits. On registration of the FIR, investigation commenced. During investigation, on the disclosure statement of co-accused, name of the petitioner was surfaced and thus, he was arrayed as an accused in the present case. She was arrested on 07.03.2024. Petitioner earlier also approached this Court by way of filing of CRM-M-38447-2024 and CRM-M-56416-2024, which were declined vide orders dated 03.10.2024 and 19.11.2024, respectively, passed by this Court. She approached the Court of Ld. Additional Sessions Judge, Kurukshetra for grant of bail, however, after hearing both the sides, the application was declined by the trial Court vide order dated 23.10.2024. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the present third petition.

3. It has been vehemently contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is falsely implicated in this case. It is submitted that the allegations are regarding siphoning of Rs.52 lacs from the complainant, however, the petitioner is neither named in the FIR, nor



any role has been attributed to her. It is only on the disclosure statement of the co-accused, the petitioner has been arrayed as an accused in the present case and the disclosure statement in itself is not an admissible evidence. He has drawn the attention of this Court to the common order passed by this Court in **CRM-M No.42397 of 2024, CRM-M No.55978 of 2024** dated 04.03.2025, whereby co-accused of the petitioner, namely, Paramjeet Singh and Himmat Singh have been granted the concession of bail. He has submitted that case of the petitioner is at par with the co-accused, who have been granted bail by this Court. He submits that the petitioner was involved in two more cases, however, she is on bail in one of the case. It is also submitted that the investigation is complete and on framing of charges, the material witnesses already stands examined thus, in the facts and circumstances of the present case, petitioner deserves to be granted regular bail.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. He has stated that the petitioner was part of the conspiracy with the co-accused and by posing as CBI officials, all the accused have duped the complainant for an amount of Rs.52 lacs. However, he endorsed the fact that the case of petitioner is at par with the co-accused, namely, Paramjeet Singh and Himmat Singh, who have already been granted bail by this Court. He, on instructions, has submitted that out of total 11 prosecution witnesses, 05 witnesses have been examined. He, submits that petitioner was involved in 02 more cases, however, out of them, she is on bail in one case.

5. On hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner before this Court was arrayed as an accused on the basis of disclosure statement of the co-accused. It has not



been denied that case of the petitioner is at par with the co-accused, who have already been enlarged on bail by this Court in **CRM-M No.42397 of 2024 and CRM-M No.55978 of 2024** vide common order dated 04.03.2025. The petitioner is behind bars since 07.03.2024. Out of total 11 prosecution witnesses, 05 witnesses have already been examined. As submitted by learned State counsel petitioner was involved in 02 more cases, however, out of them, she is on bail in one case.

6. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. The trial of the case will take sufficiently long time. Thus, keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeed in making out a case for grant of regular bail. Accordingly, present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on her furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case. In case the bail bonds are not furnished by the applicant/appellant during the period of 07 days from today, then his further custody period after one week will not be counted in the present case.

(**RAJESH BHARDWAJ**)
JUDGE

07.03.2025
ps-I

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