



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

208

CRM-M-49588-2024

Date of decision: 06.05.2025

Annu

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. Pardeep Goyal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Karan Sharma, DAG, Haryana.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail under Section 438 of the Cr.P.C. in case FIR No.411 dated 29.06.2024 under Sections 408, 406, 420, 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station Mujesar, District Faridabad.

2. On 13.01.2025, while noticing the following submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, this Court had granted the concession of interim bail to the petitioner and asked her to join investigation:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner inter alia contends, that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the FIR in question, wherein she is accused of having conspired with her husband co-accused Deepak, of cheating M/s Blaspro Technologies Pvt. Ltd. (hereinafter referred to as, ‘the Company’). It is contended that as per the allegations levelled in the FIR in question that she conspired with her husband co-accused Deepak, who tampered with salary records, fabrication of documents and falsified the attendance record of the employees, as a result of which an amount of ₹30.00 lacs was



CRM-M-49588-2024

misappropriated.

It has been asserted that the petitioner was neither an employee of the Company nor involved in any managerial responsibilities; the petitioner had no direct role in the alleged offences, and the primary allegations are directed against her husband, co-accused Deepak Kumar, who allegedly transferred salary amounts into the petitioner's account.

It has been further submitted that the petitioner's 3 year old son is a specially-abled child with 100% brain disability, rendering him incapable of performing even basic daily activities. Due to his condition, the child is entirely dependant on the petitioner for his care. It is further submitted that no recovery is to be made from the petitioner and that she is willing to cooperate fully with the investigation."

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of order dated 13.01.2025, the petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.

4. Learned State counsel, on instructions, does not dispute the factum of the petitioner having joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency. He, on further instructions, submits that the petitioner is not required for further investigation much less for her custodial interrogation.

5. In view of the above, the petition is allowed and interim order dated 13.01.2025, is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C./482(2) of the BNSS.

06.05.2025

Vinay

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

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