



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

204

CRM-M-52984-2024 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 05.05.2025

ARCHANA KUMAR

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present : Ms. Surbhi Singla and Mr. Rajat, Advocates for the petitioner.

Mr. Vipul Sherwal, AAG Haryana.

Mr. Aditya, Advocate for
Ms. Sharmila Sharma, Advocate for the complainant.

SANJIV BERRY, J. (ORAL)

By way of present petition filed under Section 482 Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case
FIR (Annexure P-1) as under:

FIR No.	Dated	Sections	Police Station
237	29.06.2024	406, 420, 120-B IPC	Central Faridabad, Haryana

2. It is *inter alia* contended by learned counsel for the petitioner
that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the case.
She contends that the husband of the petitioner had been working as
Investment Consultant along with the complainant, who is also working in
the same premises. She contends that the petitioner has no concern with the



said transaction, however, some amount invested by the complainant had been transferred by the husband of the petitioner in the account of the petitioner for the business startup. She further contends that there is a delay in lodging of the complaint by the complainant in this case. She submits that the petitioner is ready to join investigation and has prayed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

3. *Per contra*, learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant while referring to the status report submitted by State has opposed the petition on the ground that the petitioner along with her husband had cheated the complainant of ₹1.63 crores on the pretext of getting good returns and some part of the amount had been transferred in the account of the petitioner. He submits that petitioner is a habitual offender as four other criminal cases of similar nature are registered against the petitioner. Thus, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required to unearth the *modus operandi*, adopted by the petitioner. As such, prays for dismissal of the bail petition.

4. After considering the rival contentions and perusing the record, it transpires that as per the case of prosecution the petitioner along with her husband had allured the complainant and asked him to lend ₹20 lakhs for 15 months @ 3% per month, which the complainant paid for making investment in immovable properties, however, neither the property was given nor the amount was returned to the complainant, thereby cheated the complainant of his hard earned money to the tune of ₹1.63 crores.

5. The petitioner is specifically named in the FIR and she happens



to be the beneficiary, as part payment of the cheated amount has been deposited in the bank account of the petitioner. The custodial interrogation of the petitioner is warranted to recover the defrauded amount and to unearth the *modus operandi*. Therefore, considering the serious nature and gravity of offence, it is observed that no case is made out in favour of the petitioner for grant of anticipatory bail, as a consequence, the petition is hereby dismissed.

6. Any observation made above shall not be construed as opinion of this Court on the merits of the case.

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

05.05.2025
S.Sharma(syr)

i)	Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
ii)	Whether reportable?	Yes/No