

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-29985 of 2016  
Date of Decision: 29.08.2016

Priyanka .....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana and another .....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RITU BAHRI

Present:- Mr.Sunil Saharan, Advocate for the petitioner.

\*\*\*\*\*

**RITU BAHRI, J. (ORAL)**

The instant petition has been filed under Section 439(2) Cr.P.C. for cancellation of anticipatory bail granted to the respondent No.2 namely Rohtash son of Nihal Singh passed by learned Addl.Sessions Judge-I, Fatehabad, vide order dated 10.08.2016 (Annexure P-1) in case FIR No.70 dated 01.08.2016 under Sections 354(D), 354A(1), 341, 506 IPC registered at Police Station Women Police Station, Fatehabad, District Fatehabad (Annexure P-2).

A perusal of the order shows that petitioner moved an application on 01.08.2016 before the police that the accused/respondent No.2- Rohtash used to pass remarks and used to intervene her while passing the road for the last 15-20 days and on 16.07.2016, he tried to outrage her modesty and when the petitioner objected and raised alarm, then he ran away from there by extending threats to kill her if she lodged any complaint against him.

Respondent No.2 submitted before the trial Court that petitioner became enemy against him because he moved an application to Program

Officer, ICDS Department, Fatehabad and Health Minister Sh.Anil Viz, Minister of Haryana, against her when she did not forward the form of the respondent No.2 to higher officer for taking benefit from the Government Scheme namely “Aapki Beti Hamari Beti” on the birth of a daughter of respondent No.2. The petitioner was a criminal lady having records of indulging the persons falsely in the similar cases and later on compromises the matters after fetching lot of money from them.

The trial Court granted anticipatory bail to respondent No.2 after considering the fact that respondent No.2 was ready and willing to join the investigation subject to the compliance of conditions laid down under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C. and no recovery of any kind was to be effected from the respondent No.2.

Keeping in view the above, no crucial ground is made out to interfere in the order dated 10.08.2016 (Annexure P-1), granting anticipatory bail to respondent No.2, the present petition is dismissed as such.

**(RITU BAHRI)**  
**JUDGE**

**29.08.2016**  
*anil*

*Whether speaking/reasoned :* *Yes/No.*

*Whether reportable* *Yes/No.*