IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

105 **CRM-M-65331-2025**
Date of decision: 19.11.2025

DEEPIKA

....Petitioner

V/s

STATE OF HARYANA

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL

Present: Mr. Vikas Bali, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr.Tapan Masta, Addl.A.G., Haryana.

*****

H.S.GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner seeks the concession of anticipatory bail in FIR No. 584 dated 27.12.2024 registered under Sections 420, 406, 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC at Police Station Dabua, District Faridabad.

2. The allegations of the prosecution are that the petitioner, in conspiracy with co-accused Lakhanpal, who is stated to be the principal accused and was working as a Direct Selling Agent (DSA) of the bank, has embezzled an amount exceeding ₹ 7 crores by facilitating sanction of loans on the basis of forged and fabricated documents. The petitioner is alleged to have been working directly under him as his Assistant. It has also come during investigation that approximately ₹21 lakh of the defrauded amount has been credited into the bank accounts of the petitioner, for which she has not furnished any satisfactory explanation. The name of the petitioner surfaced during the disclosure statement of co-accused Lakhanpal, who has specifically stated that the petitioner assisted him in preparation of forged documents, uploading fraudulent loan applications, and facilitating loan approvals by misusing access to bank officials. The prosecution submits that the devices used for creation of forged documents, as well as the trail of diverted amounts, are yet to be recovered and fully traced.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that she has no role except being an assistant of the co-accused, she is a woman and a single mother and nothing is to be recovered from her. It is submitted that she has been implicated solely on the basis of the disclosure statement of co-accused.

4. Learned State counsel has submitted that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is essential to understand how the fraud was planned, to find out who else was involved, to recover the missing money, and to seize the electronic devices used to make the fake documents. The State also emphasized that the fraud is very large, involving many borrowers and causing a loss of more than ₹7 crore to the bank, and therefore bail should not be granted.

5. After hearing learned counsel for both the parties, this Court is of the view that there are serious and specific allegations against the petitioner. An amount of ₹21 lakh has been found credited to her bank accounts, which *prima facie* appears to be part of the cheated money and therefore requires a detailed investigation. Her mere act of joining the investigation is not enough in the present circumstances, as the financial

trail, electronic evidence, forged documents, and the exact role of each accused are still to be fully uncovered. These aspects cannot be properly investigated without the petitioner's custodial interrogation.

6. Considering the gravity of allegations, this Court is not inclined to grant the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the present petition stands dismissed.

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

19.11.2025
poonam

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