

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

CRM M-33185 of 2020 (O&M)

Date of Decision: January 21, 2021

Ravi Kumar	...	Petitioner
Versus		
State of Punjab	...	Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE FATEH DEEP SINGH

Present : Mr. Pankaj Bhardwaj, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Jagmohan Ghuman, DAG, Punjab.

FATEH DEEP SINGH, J. (Oral)

The matter has been taken up through video-conferencing on account of outbreak of pandemic COVID-19.

Petitioner Ravi Kumar who has come up in this second anticipatory bail application under Section 438 Cr.P.C. in case bearing FIR No. 227 dated 21.08.2020 (Annexure P-1) got registered at Police Station Rama Mandi, District Jalandhar under Section 294 IPC, Section 66-A Information and Technology Act, 2002 and Section 67 of Information and

Technology Act, 2002 added later on, the first one having been dismissed by this Court vide order dated 29.09.2020.

The allegations against the petitioner has come from young lady aged 26 years. In her allegations she alleges that accused worked as a mason at their house and managed to click her objectionable photos and, thereafter, left for foreign country. It is subsequently, he has come back and started showing photos of the lady to her co-villagers and even made the same viral leading to registration of the present case.

Upon hearing the arguments of the two sides, it is fairly conceded that previous anticipatory bail application of the petitioner was declined by this court through detailed orders dated 29.12.2020. The plea that is sought to be raised by petitioner's counsel that it was a consensual relationship for which a CD has been placed on the records was never put-forth in the previous bail application and, thus, a debatable issue arises over its veracity. In spite of more than 05 months having lapsed after the FIR was registered and 04 months after declining him the previous anticipatory bail application, the petitioner has kept him away from law and thus in view of the same, such a conduct is depreciable. More so in the light of plea raised on behalf of the petitioner that the parties have settled their dispute is rightly negated by the learned State counsel, who has claimed that the petitioner has through influence is

trying to pressurize the complainant side and after the first compromise fell through, second has come about certainly is a reflective of the manner in which the petitioner is trying to influence the prosecution side.

Finding no merit, the petition stands dismissed.

January 21, 2021

amit rana

(FATEH DEEP SINGH)

JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No