

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Sr. No.210

CRM-M-44414-2020

Date of decision : 11.01.2021

Poonam

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL

Present: Mr.A.K.Singal, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr.Ashok Kumar Sehrawat, DAG, Haryana.

DEEPAK SIBAL, J. (ORAL)

Case taken up through video conferencing.

Through the present petition filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. the petitioner seeks the grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.714 dated 09.09.2020, registered under Sections 120B/34/384/506 IPC (Sections 323/392 IPC added later on) at Police Station City Panipat, district Panipat.

On 09.09.2020, the complainant-Subhash made a complaint to the police that on 18.08.2020 he received a telephone call from a lady who lured him to reach near Sakil Petrol Pump, Panipat; when he reached there one Neelam met him and took him to a house near Salarganj Gate nearby Panipat Mandi; at the house there were other ladies and a boy who finding the petitioner in a compromising position with Neelam beat him and threatened him that in case he does not give Rs.2 lakhs to them then they will implicate him in a criminal case including a case of rape; Rs.85,000/- which were lying in his car and keys of his car were snatched by them and that he was further issued death threats in case he disclosed this incident to anybody else.

On the basis of above, a formal FIR was lodged the investigation of which revealed that the petitioner was a member of a gang which used to call and lure men with their sweet talks; after taking them to a designated place such men used to be caught in a compromising position; then they were blackmailed;

the petitioner's role was described in detail by co-accused Beermati-the alleged gang leader to be of one of the active members of the gang and on such basis the petitioner was nominated as an accused.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case; the only evidence against her is the statement of a co-accused which has no evidentiary value; there is an unexplained delay of 24 days in lodging of the FIR and that the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation as and when called by the investigating agency.

Learned State counsel opposes the grant of bail to the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner is a member of a gang which used to call and lure men with their sweet talks; took them to a place where after catching them in a compromising position used to blackmail them and that the petitioner was earlier involved in three other cases of similar nature though she had been acquitted in them.

There are serious allegations against the petitioner who is alleged to be an active member of a gang which calls and lure men with their sweet talk; take them to a designated place where they are caught in a compromising position and later blackmailed. For such reason and to find out if the petitioner is involved in other offences of similar nature as also if there are other persons involved in the crime, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is considered necessary especially when the investigation in the present case is still pending.

Dismissed.

11.01.2021

shamsher

[DEEPAK SIBAL]

JUDGE

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