

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

1. CRM-M-1986-2022 (O&M)

Meenu Verma @ Preet Verma @ Meenu Rani

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

2. CRM-M-2387-2022 (O&M)

Gurtej Puri

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

Date of decision: 16.05.2022

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present:- Mr. J. S. Dhaliwal, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-1986-2022.

Mr. P. K. S. Phoolka, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-2387-2022.

Mr. Joginder Pal Ratra, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Lupil Gupta, Advocate
for the complainant.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (Oral)

This common order shall dispose of above noted two petitions

as they arise out of the same FIR.

Prayer in these petitions, filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C., is for grant of anticipatory bail to petitioners Meenu Verma @ Preet Verma @ Meenu Rani and Gurtej Puri in FIR No. 221 dated 30.12.2021 registered under Sections 384, 120-B, 149 IPC (Section 388 IPC added later) at Police Station City-2, Mansa, District Mansa.

While staying the arrest of petitioner Meenu Verma @ Preet Verma @ Meenu Rani, the following order was passed on 18.01.2022 in CRM-M-1986-2022:

“Counsel for the petitioner has argued that the FIR was registered at the instance of Amit Kumar, with the allegations that he is a Computer Teacher in a government school and received a phone call from a lady from her mobile bearing No.8699158721 to his mobile bearing No.7009904206 on 26.12.2021 wherein, she disclosed her name and invited him to meet her and when the complainant went to meet her, she took him inside the house and bolted the door of the house from inside and started doing obscene acts with him and also started alluring him to have sex with her and disclosed her real name and said she called him in her pet’s name to the complainant. Thereafter, she started demanding money from the complainant. It is further submitted that the petitioner is a lady aged about 40 years and has no criminal antecedents, however, this fact is disputed by counsel for the State assisted by counsel for the complainant that the petitioner on an earlier occasion has registered one FIR under Section 376 IPC and one FIR under the I.T. Act, by alluring the persons and in order to blackmail them and it is a clear case of honey trap.

Counsel for the complainant has further submitted

that, in fact, it is a group of 05 persons, who are working together and are alluring the innocent persons in their trap and one person namely Basant Singh, has already been arrested and he has been released on regular bail.

List again on 29.03.2022.”

Thereafter, noticing the aforesaid order, petitioner Gurtej Puri was also granted the concession interim bail on 20.01.2022.

Learned counsel, appearing for petitioner Meenu Verma @ Preet Verma @ Meenu Rani, has argued that the petitioner is not medically fit and, therefore, the interim order may be confirmed and the petitioner may be granted the concession of anticipatory bail.

Learned counsel, appearing for petitioner Gurtej Puri, has argued that there is no allegation against the petitioner that when the alleged videography was done regarding complainant, he was present at the spot and the only allegation against him is that he was present at the petrol pump, where the complainant had gone to pay money along with one Basant Singh.

Reply, by way of affidavit of the Senior Superintendent of Police, Mansa has been filed today in Court. In reply, it is stated that the investigation was conducted by the SIT, headed by DSP (Detective), Mansa. It is further stated that as per investigation, petitioner Meenu Verma is the daughter of Balvir Singh and she is residing with her daughter in a house at Ward No. 4, Mansa, which is owned by one Krishan Kumar. Petitioner Meenu Verma is a divorcee and has solemnized five marriages. The first marriage was performed with one Gurwinder Singh @ Raju in the year 1999 and out of said wedlock, a son was born, who is now 21 years old, namely Lovepreet Singh and he is residing with her father Gurwinder Singh @

Raju. After obtaining a panchayati divorce from Gurwinder Singh @ Raju, Meenu Verma performed second marriage with one Ashok Kumar and out of this wedlock, two children were born, out of whom, the son is residing with his father and the daughter is residing with petitioner Meenu Verma. In 2012, petitioner Meenu Verma performed her third marriage with one Pargat Singh, however, no child was born out of this wedlock and the marriage was dissolved. She performed fourth marriage with Mandeep Singh @ Tidda of District Mansa o 14.12.2014 and petitioner again obtained divorce from Mandeep Singh @ Tidda by taking some money from him.

It is further stated in the reply that on 11.08.2017, petitioner Meenu Verma performed her fifth marriage with Gurpreet Singh son of Surjeet Singh, resident of Marada Heda Dakala, Patiala and again by taking some money, she has left the home. Thereafter, she started living in live-in-relationship with Sandeepal Singh resident of Mansa and after picking up some quarrel with the family members of Sandeepal Singh, both of them started residing separately, as per compromise dated 03.02.2020.

It is further stated that in all the marriages, the reason for the divorce or separation was the quarrelsome nature of petitioner Meenu Verma and presently she is residing in a house, wherein she has filed a suit for permanent injunction against her dispossession, which was dismissed by the civil Court on 21.03.2022. It is also found by the SIT that the neighbours of the petitioner have disclosed that suspicious persons are visiting her house at odd hours and despite the warning issued by the society, she has not mend her ways. It is also stated that even father of the

petitioner has disowned her, as per public notification dated 04.07.2014, issued the newspapers Rozana Spokesman.

With regard to present FIR, it is stated in reply that petitioner Meenu Verma is habitual of trapping innocent persons in honeytrap and extorting easy money from them. The petitioner got an FIR No. 26 dated 17.04.2018 registered under Section 376 IPC against Satpal Singh @ Satti and Jasveer Singh, residents of Mansa and as per investigation, the story putforth by the petitioner was found untruthful and a cancellation report was prepared on 05.06.2018. Again, the petitioner has got FIR No. 93 dated 14.06.2021 registered under Section 67-A of the IT Act against one Deepak Garg and the investigation of the said case is pending.

With regard to present FIR, it is stated in reply that as per additional statement of complainant Amit Gogna, it has come that complainant was called by petitioner Meenu Verma and when he visited her house, she bolted the door of her house and started instigating the complainant for sexual relations. In the meantime, one unknown lady and one unknown man knocked the door and both of them entered into house. Petitioner Meenu Verma was addressing the man as 'Fauji' and the lady as 'Balvir Kaur'. The said persons forcibly took off the clothes of the complainant and after capturing the half naked video of the complainant, they also took out Rs. 5,000/-, an ATM card and Aadhar Card from the pocket of the complainant. The petitioner as well as said persons started blackmailing the complainant for the payment of Rs. 5 Lakh, failing which, they threatened him that they will publicize his video on internet and will also implicate him in a false case of rape and he will be sent to judicial

custody. Further, as per DDR No. 27 dated 06.01.2022, Section 388 IPC was added in the present case and again vide DDR No. 34 dated 25.03.2021, co-accused Balvir Kaur was arrested, who disclosed that the person called as 'Fauji' is Jagdeep Singh @ Gullu Mann, resident of Mansa, who is involved in five more FIRs. The details of the FIRs are as under:

Sr. No.	FIR No. & Date	Under Section	Police Station	Status
1	FIR No. 34/04.03.2009	307/324/323/506/356/379/148/149 IPC	City-II Mansa	Acquitted
2	FIR No. 13/09.02.2016	307/451/324/506/356/379/148/149 IPC	City-I Mansa	Quashed
3	FIR No. 101/14.10.2016	325/326/341/148/149 IPC	GRP, Bathinda	Cancelled
4	FIR No. 49/23.07.2017	307/341/324/323/325/326/427/148/149 IPC	City-II Mansa	Acquitted
5	FIR No. 150/10.09.2020	458/323/509/506/34 IPC and 25/27/54/59 Arms Act	City-I Mansa	Pending

Learned State counsel has submitted that petitioner Meenu Verma @ Preet Verma @ Meenu Rani has procured the interim protection by concealing the aforesaid facts.

After hearing learned counsel for the parties, I find no ground to grant the concession of anticipatory bail to petitioner Meenu Verma @ Preet Verma @ Meenu Rani. Accordingly, the order dated 18.01.2022, staying her arrest, is recalled and **CRM-M-1986-2022 is dismissed**.

However, since petitioner Gurtej Puri is not involved in any other case and as per report of the SIT, there is no allegation that he was in conspiracy with petitioner Meenu Verma, except that he was present at the petrol pump, where the complainant had gone to pay money to petitioner Meenu Verma, the petition bearing **CRM-M-2387-2022 is allowed** and the order dated 20.01.2022, granting interim bail, is made absolute, subject to

the conditions envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

The order dated 20.01.2022, granting interim bail to petitioner Gurtej Puri, shall be read to have been passed in addition to Section 388 IPC.

A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of other connected case.

16.05.2022
Waseem Ansari

(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No