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

**(Heard through VC)**

CRM No.17625-2021 in/and
CRM-M-17366 of 2021 (O&M)
Date of Decision: July 13, 2021

Shaliesh Mehta

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR**

Present:- Mr. Aditya Sanghi, Advocate
for the petitioner.

********

**JAISHREE THAKUR, J.** (Oral)

**CRM-17625-2021**

1. This is an application that has been filed seeking to prepone hearing in the main case, which is now listed for 26.08.2021.

2. For the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is allowed. Hearing in the main case is preponed and the same is taken up for hearing today.

**CRM-M-17366-2021**

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.74 dated 08.03.2021, under Sections 323, 324, 354, 354-A, 354-B, 379-B, 506 of Indian Penal Code, registered at Police Station Adampur, District Hisar,

VIJAY SAINI
2021.07.15 15:50
I attest to the authenticity and
accuracy of this document

Haryana.

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner would contend that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the said FIR. It is submitted that the petitioner and the complainant were working together in a school and would travel together in the same car. It is submitted that the petitioner and the complainant had developed friendly relations as would be evident from the whatsapp conversation and the call details available. As the complainant became fearful of her family and husband knowing about the relationship that the instant FIR came to be registered with false allegation that the petitioner had tried to molest her and also inflicted a knife injury. It is submitted that no such incident took place. It is also argued that the medical of the complainant does not support the statement given by the complainant that she was dragged by the car when she tried to alight from it.

3. Notice of motion.

4. At this stage, Ms. Deepshikha Chauhan, AAG Haryana, who is appearing through the medium of video conferencing, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. Similarly, Mr. D.P.S. Bajwa, Advocate accepts notice on behalf of the complainant.

5. Counsel appearing of the respondent-State and the complainant oppose the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, while contending that there are specific allegations that have been levelled against the petitioner herein, who tried to outrage the modesty of the complainant, apart from snatching her mobile phone and causing injuries to her with a knife. It is submitted that the whatsapp messages would reveal that the complainant

VIJAY SAINI
2021.07.15 15:50
I attest to the authenticity and
accuracy of this document

had objected to the messages sent to her and therefore, it cannot be stated that the petitioner and the complainant had friendly relations.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

7. The allegations in the FIR are specific to the extent that the petitioner had tried to molest the complainant while travelling in the same car. It is mentioned that when she tried to call her husband, the petitioner snatched her mobile phone and also caused injuries with a knife. The medical report also revel injuries, which cannot be said to be self-inflicted. Apart from that there is also a statement of another witness Dalip Singh. Prima facie, the allegations as set out in the FIR are of a serious nature and cannot be brushed aside summarily. Under these circumstances, once custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required for a result oriented investigation, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

8. In view of the above, the instant petition is hereby dismissed.

**(JAISHREE THAKUR)**
**JUDGE**

**July 13, 2021**
*vijay saini*

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No
Whether reportable Yes/No

VIJAY SAINI
2021.07.15 15:50
I attest to the authenticity and
accuracy of this document