UPMA010030832026

In the Court of Sessions Judge, Mau.

Present:Sanjay Kumar Yadav–III, H.J.S.

Judicial Officer Code No. UP2023

Anticipatory Bail Application No. 1014 of 2026

Savitri Devi ------- Accused–applicant

Versus

State of U.P. ------- Opposite Party

ORDER

1. Present application for anticipatory bail has been moved on behalf of the accused applicant Savitri Devi involved in case crime No. 186 of 2024, for the offences punishable under Sections 420, 504, 506 of the Indian Penal Code within the territorial jurisdiction of Police Station Sarailakhansi, District Mau.
2. The brief facts of the case as per First Information Report are that on 18.02.2019 at about 1.00 PM, accused persons Ramdarash Yadav, Savitri Devi, Kamlesh Yadav, Akhilesh Yadav and Anita came to the house of the complainant and suggested her that the money which is remain after selling of land, be invested in Trinity Multi State Co-operative Credit Society Ltd. Head office c-2/First Flat Balaji Complex Vikas Nagar Sector-2, Lucknow and its branch is located at Mohammadabad Gohna, District Mau. They suggested the complainant that if she invests her money, she earned Rs. 21,000/- per money interest and she can withdraw her money after one year. On 20.02.2019 the complainant has transferred Rs. 7 Lakhs in the account of accused Ramdaras. They provided seven bonds of Rs. 1 Lakh each in the name of son of the complainant, Indrajeet. After one year, when the complainant went to the office and asked for her money, the accused Savitri told her that after five years, she got Rs. 19,60,000/-. There was Covid-19 Pandemic period and she suggested to wait for five yeas. After five years, when the complainant went to the office for getting her money back, the branch office of Mohammadabad Gohana, Mau has been found closed. When the complainant has demanded her money back, on 12.02.2024 the accused persons came to the house of complainant and they abused and threatened her to kill; they also beat her after entering into her house. They snatched her wedding necklace.
3. The learned counsel for the accused-applicant submits that she has been falsely implicated in this case. No offence has been made out against her. She is simple and village cultured lady; only she makes her signs on papers. Her husband was posted as Assistant Manager in said Triniti Multi State Cooperative Society Ltd. Branch Mohammadabad Gohana, Mau. The complainant and her son has voluntarily deposited their money according to the terms & conditions of the scheme. They have received 7 bonds of Rs. 1 Lakh each and as per scheme, they have paid Rs. 21,000/- in favour of each bond from time to time. The accused-applicant has not usurped any money. While during Covid-19 Pandemic lock-down period, the higher officials of the bank has stopped the operation of the bank and

the chairman A.K. Sharma has sent a letter to branch office taking whole responsibility of payment of investors with Rakesh Sharma. The accused–applicant has no any criminal antecedents. Main accused Ramdaras has already been granted anticipatory bail b y this Court.

4. The learned In–charge District Government Counsel (Crl.) opposes the application for anticipatory bail and submits that main role of the accused Ramdaras has been assigned, who is said to be husband of the accused applicant. The accused and her husband have taken money from complainant in the face of investment and usurped her money. He prayed for dismissal of anticipatory bail application.
5. This Court has heard the learned In–charge District Government Counsel (Crl.) along with learned counsel for the accused applicant and perused the material evidence on record.
6. It is allegations against the accused applicant that on assurance of accused applicant and others, on 20.02.2019 the complainant has transferred Rs. 7 Lakhs in the account of co–accused Ramdaras, who is said to be husband of the accused applicant. They provided seven bonds of Rs. 1 Lakh each in the name of son of the complainant, Indrajeet, which is said to have been usurped by the accused applicant and others. In the case in hand, the accused–applicant has filed the copies of said 7 bonds of Rs. 1 Lakh each and the interest paid of Rs. 21,000/– each thereof has also been enclosed. The accused–applicant has stated that the complainant has invested her money voluntarily in the said scheme after reading all terms & conditions. No any criminal antecedents of accused applicant has been adduced by the prosecution. Charge sheet has been filed. The offence is triable by Ist Class Magistrate and main accused Ramdaras has already been granted anticipatory bail. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, as well as nature of the offence, and role assigned to the accused–applicant, fling of charge sheet along with grant of anticipatory bail to co–accused Ramdaras, without expressing any opinion on the merit of the case, this Court finds it a fit case for anticipatory bail.
7. Hence, the application for anticipatory bail moved by the accused applicant Savitri Devi is hereby, allowed. Station Officer of Police Station Sarailakhansi, Mau is directed that if he arrests the accused applicant, accused applicant will be released on anticipatory bail on her executing a personal bond of Rs. 30,000/– and two sureties in the like amount on the following conditions:–

   (a). He shall appear before trial Court on each date and he will not move unnecessary adjournment application.

   (b). The accused applicant shall not directly or indirectly make 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 tamper with the evidence.

   (c). The accused applicant shall not leave India without permission of the Court.

[Sanjay Kumar Yadav–III]
UP2023
Sessions Judge, Mau.

Dated: 11.06.2026
Typed by–Anil Kumar Srivastava, P.S.