

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

**CRM-M-22686-2018 (O&M)
Decided on : 13.02.2020**

Raman Seth

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and another

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

PRESENT: Mr. B.S. Rana, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Gagandeep Rana, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Ashish Sanghi, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. S.S. Brar, Advocate
for the complainant.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (Oral)

The instant petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C., for grant of anticipatory bail, in case FIR No. 57, dated 09.12.2017, registered under Sections 354-A, 506, 376, 511 IPC, at Police Station Women Panchkula, District Panchkula.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is the father-in-law of the complainant. The complainant, in fact, all along was treated with love and affection by the petitioner and was never-ever harassed, much less, sexually assaulted by him. It was alleged that in fact, it was the complainant and her family, who indulged in unruly and abusive behaviour after entering their house, as a result of which, the petitioner had to file a complaint against them with the SHO, Mani Majra, which is annexed as Annexure P-3 with the instant petition. It was further submitted that if the petitioner had actually tried to sexually molest the complainant for the first time in February, 2017, she would not have continued chatting

with the petitioner till October, 2017. In support of his contention, learned

Sr. counsel for the petitioner has placed reliance on the telephonic messages between the petitioner and the complainant, which are annexed as Annexure P-1 along with the petition. It was urged that the messages lent credence to the fact that the allegations of sexual molestation and assault were nothing but a concocted story weaved out by the complainant.

Learned State counsel, however, while opposing the grant of concession of anticipatory bail, submitted that serious allegations, had been levelled against him by the complainant, who was his daughter-in-law. It was further submitted that the messages so annexed were fabricated by the petitioner and this was precisely the reason that his custodial interrogation was required.

In view of the serious allegations levelled against the petitioner, no ground for grant of anticipatory bail is made out.

Dismissed.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

February 13, 2020

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No