

102+211

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-18056-2021 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 04.08.2021

NARINDER SHARMA

.....*Petitioner*

V/s.

STATE OF HARYANA

.....*Respondent*

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL.

Present: Mr. Karan Vir Nanda, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Ms. Gaganpreet Kaur, AAG, Haryana.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (Oral)

CRM-23518-2021

Application is allowed as prayed for subject to all just exceptions.

CRM-M-18056-2021

This is the first petition filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.34, dated 09.04.2021 lodged under Sections 354-A, 506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 registered at Police Station Women Ambala City, District Ambala, Haryana.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that it is a case of false implication against the petitioner which is evident from certain whatsapp conversations which he has placed on record between the complainant and two other ladies which reveals that the case in question had been foisted upon him by the complainant in collusion with one Raj Rani who too had registered an FIR No.25 under Section 376 of the IPC dated 16.03.2021, 1860 against the petitioner. He submits that the FIR in

question was registered soon after the petitioner was granted bail in the aforementioned case which makes it abundantly clear that the complainant in the instant case as well as the complainant in FIR No.25 dated 16.03.2021 had colluded with each other in falsely implicating the petitioner in false cases. He further submits that the offence under Section 354-A is bailable and hence the petitioner be extended the concession of anticipatory bail.

Per contra, Learned State counsel, on instructions HC Salma, has vehemently opposed the prayer and submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner. She submits that there are serious allegations against the petitioner of indulging in inappropriate behavior with the complainant. She further submits that due to the criminal antecedents of the petitioner, he does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail. She, thus, submits that the instant petition be dismissed as his custodial interrogation would be required.

Heard.

Prima facie, there are specific allegations levelled against the petitioner of indulging in inappropriate behaviour. Besides this, the petitioner, as has also been submitted by the learned State counsel, is a man of criminal antecedents in as much as he is habitual of indulging in such like acts. Keeping in view the criminal antecedents of the petitioner, he does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

Petition stands dismissed.

August 4, 2021

Ess Kay

**[MANJARI NEHRU KAUL]
JUDGE**

Whether speaking / reasoned
Whether Reportable

:
:

Yes /No.
Yes/No