

In virtual Court

CRM-M-32308-2020

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-32308-2020 (O&M)
Date of decision: 15.10.2020

Raj Sandeep @ Raju

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present: Mr. Umesh Aggarwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Joginder Pal Ratra, DAG, Punjab.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (ORAL)

This is 2nd petition for grant of regular bail in FIR No.218 dated 19.05.2020 under Sections 354-D, 306, 509, 511 IPC and Sections 376, 354-A, 354-B, 506, 510, 116 IPC (added later on), registered at Police Station Islamabad, District Amritsar; earlier one was dismissed as withdrawn on 30.06.2020.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that as per allegations in the FIR, registered at the instance of victim 'K', she came in contact with the petitioner about three years ago and developed relationship with him and he had clicked some photographs of her. When the victim asked the petitioner that he

should stop following her and not to harass, as she is a married lady, after some time, he again started harassing her. It is further stated that the victim informed this to her husband and thereafter, the matter was taken to the police, where some compromise was effected, in which the petitioner undertook that he will not contact her either personally or telephonically. After some time, the petitioner started sending obscene messages on the mobile phone of the victim and even tried to blackmail her through earlier photographs. The petitioner thereafter started calling husband of the victim as well as her sister Pooja. Again, this happened for long time and the victim was so disturbed that she even tried to consume some intoxicant tablets.

Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that there are no allegations of rape, as it was a case of consensus between them. It is further submitted that Section 376 IPC was added later on, on the basis of a supplementary statement dated 01.06.2020 and challan has been presented and the petitioner is no more required for custodial investigation.

Learned State counsel has opposed the prayer for bail on the ground that the petitioner is blackmailing the victim, as he firstly developed physical relations with her and it has come in the supplementary statement of the victim that under threat, the petitioner again made physical relations with her. It is submitted that there are number of instances given in the FIR, when the petitioner despite warning harassed the victim by visiting her house during late night and by sending obscene messages on her mobile phone and even tried to kill her by firing gun shots.

After hearing learned counsel for the parties and going through

In virtual Court

CRM-M-32308-2020

-3-

contents of the FIR, supplementary statement and serious allegations levelled against the petitioner, I find no ground to grant him regular bail.

Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.

[ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN]
JUDGE

15.10.2020
vishnu

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether Reportable : Yes/No