

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

**Criminal Misc. No.M-6708 of 2019
Date of Decision: 04.07.2019**

Chindi Kaur

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent(s)

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARI PAL VERMA

Present:- Mr. Ashish Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Sukhbeer Singh, AAG, Punjab.

HARI PAL VERMA, J. (Oral)

Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.266 dated 15.11.2018 under Sections 376, 120-B IPC and Sections 3 and 4 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012 registered at Police Station City Faridkot, District Faridkot.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that there is no direct allegation against the petitioner and the aforesaid FIR was registered on the basis of communication received from the Chairman, Child Welfare Committee, Faridkot, to the effect that on 13.07.2018, an information was received at Child Line Toll Free No.1098 from the caller. As per this information, one unmarried girl namely Kanchan, whose age was 16 years,

was pregnant. She used to go to the place of the petitioner in Bazigar Basti. The caller had informed that the child who was going to take birth shall be sold by their family in their connivance. Therefore, keeping in view the safety of the girl, some strict action be taken in the matter. He had also told that there is possibility that similar more girls may be recovered from there.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has further argued the DSP concerned has conducted an enquiry into the matter and the petitioner has not been found involved in the case. He has referred to the enquiry report, as reproduced in Para 1 of this petition, which is part of the FIR.

Learned State counsel has filed the affidavit of Jastinder Singh, PPS, D.S.P., Sub Division, Faridkot, District Faridkot in the case along with the statement of the prosecutrix, wherein the prosecutrix has stated that she was working as household maid in the house of one Bholi. She had left the prosecutrix in the house of one Jassa Singh who used to have physical relations with her. Jassa Singh had introduced the prosecutrix to Banti who was living in the same *Gali* of Jassa Singh. Banti also had forcible relations with her. She has stated that she does not remember the date of such incidents. It is Banti who left the prosecutrix at the house of the petitioner who is also resident of Bazigar Basti.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Manjit Singh, submits that there are as many as three more cases against the petitioner under the Immoral Trafficking Act.

When learned counsel for the petitioner was confronted with the factum of aforesaid cases, he has denied about the knowledge of these cases.

Considering the fact that there are three more cases registered against the petitioner under the Immoral Trafficking Act, the petitioner is not entitled to be extended the benefit of anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.

However, in case the petitioner finds that the aforesaid information, about registration of three more cases against the petitioner under the Immoral Trafficking Act, is contrary to record, she is at liberty to seek revival of this petition.

July 04, 2019
AK

(HARI PAL VERMA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking / reasoned?

Yes / No

Whether reportable?

Yes / No