

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

**CRM M-41385 of 2016 (O&M)**

Date of Decision: 28.11.2017.

Lakhbir Singh @ Lucky

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

**CORAM : Hon'ble Mr. Justice Jitendra Chauhan**

Present : Mr. Gautam Dutt, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

Ms. Anju Arora, Addl. AG Punjab.

Mr. Achin Gupta, Advocate,  
for the complainant.

**JITENDRA CHAUHAN.J.(ORAL)**

**CRM No. 2080 of 2017 & CRM 2678 of 2017**

The applications are allowed as prayed for. Registry is directed to carry out necessary corrections in the head note of the petition.

**Main case**

The present petition has been filed under Section 438 the Cr.P.C seeking anticipatory bail in case FIR No.259 dated 31.10.2016, registered under Sections 420, 384 and 354 IPC and Section 66-E and 67 of Information Technology Act, 2000 at Police Station City Faridkot, District Faridkot.

It is contended that the present FIR is a counter-blast to the FIR got registered by the petitioner against the complainant

party. The petitioner had love affair with the complainant. In fact, the father and brother of the complainant were annoyed with the petitioner as they did not reconcile to the relationship between the petitioner and the complainant. They also inflicted injuries to the petitioner regarding which the petitioner got registered FIR (Annexure P-1) against them and to save their skin, the complainant concocted a false version and got the present FIR registered against the petitioner.

On the other hand, the learned State counsel opposes the bail application. It is submitted that the petitioner not only cheated the complainant but has also disseminated the photographs and videos of the complainant.

Heard.

It is alleged in the FIR that the petitioner and the complainant had a love affair. When the fact of the petitioner being already a married person, came to the notice of the complainant, the parents of the complainant engaged her with some other person. To frustrate the engagement of the complainant, the petitioner disseminated the photographs and video clips taken with the complainant, veracity of which is proved from the CFSL report, Mark-A. As per the report, the photographs and videos were sent from the mobile phone of the petitioner. Accordingly, considering the nature of the allegations and mischief allegedly played upon the complainant, the Court feels that it is a fit case where custodial interrogation of the

petitioner is necessary to unearth the truth. No ground for grant of concession of anticipatory bail is made out.

Dismissed.

Anything said herein above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

28.11.2017.

SN

**(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)**  
**JUDGE**

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