

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

**CRM NO. M-34937 OF 2017(O&M)
DECIDED ON : 11.10.2017**

Anil Kumar Yadav

...Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL

Present: Mr. N. S. Shekhawat, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner is seeking anticipatory bail in FIR No.408 dated 28.06.2017 under Sections 3, 4, 5, 7, 8 and 9 of the Immoral Traffic (Prevention) Act, 1956, registered at Police Station DLF, Phase II, Gurugram.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that FIR has been registered by the police as the police wanted to extort money from the owners of the mall and to defame the mall.

Learned counsel for the respondent states that the petitioner is owner of Spa where raid was conducted which revealed that immoral activities were going in at the Spa.

Heard.

The allegations against petitioner are that he is owner of the Spa wherein immoral activities were going on. A Constable

had gone there as a decoy customer and after receiving a message from him, the police party raided a room in the Spa and a boy and a girl were found in a compromising position. Money as well as other objectionable articles were recovered from the room.

The allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature and therefore, he is not entitled to concession of anticipatory bail.

Consequently, the petition stands dismissed.

However, nothing observed herein before shall be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case. It is only for the purpose of deciding whether the petitioner is entitled to concession of anticipatory bail or not.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

OCTOBER 11, 2017
shalini

- | | |
|--------------------------------|--------|
| 1. Whether speaking/reasoned : | YES/NO |
| 2. Whether reportable : | YES/NO |