IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No. 14100 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 10.05.2016

Geeta

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASWANT SINGH

Present: Mr. Sandeep Kotla, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Yashwinder Singh, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana
for the respondent/State assisted by DSP Rahul Dev.

****

JASWANT SINGH, J. (ORAL)

Prayer in this petition under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, is for grant of anticipatory bail on behalf of the petitioner-accused-Geeta in case FIR No. 662, dated 30.09.2015, for offences punishable under Sections 384, 389 of the Indian Penal Code, registered at Police Station City Bahadurgarh.

Allegations of the Investigating Agency are that petitioner-accused is part of a *Gang,* which is involved in extortion of money from respectable persons on the pretext of falsely implicating them for the offence of rape.

It is contended that the name of petitioner has surfaced on the disclosure statement of Jyoti, which is not admissible in evidence. That apart, the petitioner is willing to join the investigation and cooperate and nothing is to be recovered from her. It is also contended that the case of petitioner for grant of relief is on a better footing than that of similarly

DINESH KUMAR
2016.05.24 10:25
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document
Chandigarh

placed accused-Vinod alias Lilu alias Totla, who has already been granted anticipatory bail by the Sessions Judge, Jhajjar, vide order dated 04.01.2016 **(Annexure P-2)**.

Learned State Counsel, assisted by DSP Rahul Dev, submits that the present FIR has been lodged on the basis of investigation regarding the complaint made by one Parmod, of extortion substantial amount by the co-accused-Jyoti on the allegations of rape. The name of petitioner-accused-Geeta (landlord of Jyoti) alongwith co-accused-Vinod, including other police officials has surfaced, being part of a *Gang* involved in extracting money from unsuspecting customers by luring them in a *Honey Trap* and thereafter alleging rape. It is further submitted that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required to unravel the entire operations. It is also submitted that merely pre-arrest bail granted to co-accused-Vinod would not constitute of a valid basis in the facts of present case of grant of bail to the petitioner-accused.

Keeping in view the nature and gravity of the offence, it is felt that custodial interrogation of the petitioner in huge would be required for having a meaningful and complete investigation, therefore, no case for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner is made out.

Accordingly, the present petition stands dismissed.

May 10, 2016 **(JASWANT SINGH)**
'dk kamra' **JUDGE**

DINESH KUMAR
2016.05.24 10:25
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document
Chandigarh