

103 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

SMRITI
2020.11.11 15:25
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

CRM-M-37204-2020
Date of Decision: 11.11.2020

VIKRAM

... PETITIONER

VS.

STATE OF HARYANA

.. RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIVEK PURI

Present : Mr. Atul Yadav, Advocate
for the petitioner.

VIVEK PURI, J.(ORAL)

The matter has been taken up through video-conferencing due to COVID-19 pandemic.

Briefly, the FIR No. 93 dated 11.09.2020 under Sections 354-A, 354-D and 506 IPC and Section 67 of Information Technology Act, has been registered at Women Police Station, Manesar, District Gurugram on the basis of the statement of the complainant, who is a lady, aged about 34 years. The petitioner developed acquaintance with the complainant through telephonic calls. The petitioner also allured the complainant for providing a job to her. The petitioner had also been asking the complainant to make video call and took screen-shots of the objectionable photographs and also got two to four nude photographs of the complainant. Thereafter, he circulated the photographs and made the pictures viral.

Notice of motion.

On advance service of copy of the petition, Mr. Amrik Singh Narwal, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

It has been contended by the learned counsel for the petitioner that he is employed in army, serving at Bangalore and is a victim of honey-trap. The complainant had herself sent the photographs and he never circulated the photographs to anyone.

On the contrary, it has been pointed out by the learned State counsel that the mobile numbers, from which the pictures have been made viral, have been registered in the name of the petitioner. The screen-shots depicting the objectionable photographs of the complainant have also been taken into possession and the petitioner has exploited the complainant on the false pretext of providing employment to her.

In the case in hand, as per the allegations, the objectionable/nude photographs of the complainant have been procured by the petitioner who made them viral while sitting in Bangalore. The photographs have been taken on the false pretext of providing employment. The mobile phone connections have been procured in the name of the petitioner. The matter requires thorough probe and investigation and such like offences cannot be viewed lightly, particularly, when the same are committed against women. As such, no extraordinary circumstances are made out to extend the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Dismissed.

11.11.2020
smriti

(VIVEK PURI)
JUDGE

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