

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

Date of decision : 21.08.2020

(i) CRM-M-13949-2020 (O&M)

Mamta

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

(ii) CRM-M-3576-2020 (O&M)

Anil Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. Vikram Rana, Advocate,
for the petitioner(s) in both the petitions.

Mr. Vikrant Pamboo, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Yashveer Kharb, Advocate,
for the complainant.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J.

The matter has been taken up through video-conferencing in the light of the pandemic COVID-19 situation and as per instructions.

The instant two petitions filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners are being disposed of by this single order having arising out of common FIR No.1129 dated 04.12.2019, registered under Sections 384, 389, 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, at P.S. City Panipat.

Contents that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the

instant case. They have no role in the marriage of complainant's son with Sarita, sister of petitioner-Mamta. The instant FIR is a counter-blast to FIR No.0728 dated 25.07.2019, registered at P.S. Chandinibagh, under Sections 114,323, 376 and 511 IPC and Section 67 of the IT Act, against son of the complainant-Sushil.

On the other hand, learned State counsel submits that it has come in the investigation that the petitioners are running a racket for extorting money from innocent persons by solemnizing fake marriages. It has also transpired that petitioner-Mamta has solemnized four such marriages.

Learned counsel for the complainant contends that the petitioners had been demanding money and a plot on the pretext of entering into a compromise in FIR No.738 *ibid*. In support of his assertions, learned counsel has circulated a copy of the transcript of the conversation dated 22.07.2019 between Kuldeep son of Rajender (nephew of the complainant) with petitioner-Anil.

Heard.

As per the FIR, son of the complainant, namely, Sushil was got engaged to the sister of petitioner-Mamta in the month of October, 2018. After the engagement, the petitioner extracted amounts of Rs.20,000/- and Rs.36,000/- from the complainant on two different occasions. Thereafter, she again demanded Rs.1,00,000/- on the ground that she had no money to marry her sister. However, when the complainant showed her inability to pay the amount, the engagement was broken and the amount earlier received by her was also not returned. To the contrary, Sushil was falsely implicated

in FIR No.728 (*ibid*). It is alleged that petitioner-Mamta has been running a racket of supplying girls and extracting money from innocent persons after solemnizing marriages. Earlier also, petitioner-Mamta had solemnized marriage with Satish Verma. Thereafter, she took money from her first husband and solemnized second marriage with Parveen, third marriage with Mohammedan and fourth one with co-accused Anil Verma. The first husband, namely, Satish Verma, has also stated in his divorce petition that petitioner-Mamta had been indulging in immoral activities. It is clear from the perusal of the transcript circulated by learned counsel for the complainant that the petitioners had been demanding money and a plot for settling the criminal case i.e. FIR No.728 (*ibid*) registered against the complainant's son. The investigation is still in progress and this Court feels that the custodial interrogation of the petitioners would be necessary to unearth the truth. Therefore, no case for grant of pre-arrest bail to the petitioners is made out.

Dismissed.

However, nothing noticed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

21.08.2020
atulsethi

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

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