

CRM-M-17551-2022

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

CRM-M-17551-2022

Date of decision: 28.04.2022

Kiranpal Kaur

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Vishal Mittal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

Through this petition, the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR No.155 dated 13.09.2021, registered at Police Station City Sangrur, District Sangrur, under Sections 384, 458, 506, 149 and 120-B IPC.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case; that no money had been given by the complainant to the petitioner; that three main accused have already been arrested and that nothing is to be recovered from the petitioner.

I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner.

This is the second petition for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, the first having been dismissed as withdrawn on 10.01.2022.

As per the prosecution version, on 09.09.2021, the petitioner, who is earlier acquainted with the complainant, demanded money from him for some domestic purpose; that on the same day, the petitioner alongwith

CRM-M-17551-2022

Neha came to the house of the complainant where he alongwith Pawan Kumar, Gurjit Singh, Avtar Singh was present; that the petitioner again asked for money from him, but he showed his inability to give the same; that thereafter, the petitioner, Neha and 7-8 young boys went upstairs and gave beatings to Pawan Kumar; that the complainant, Gurjit Singh and Avtar were also given beatings by the accused; that the accused also threatened the complainant to pay Rs.15 lakh or they would get a rape case registered against Pawan Kumar and would make the video of Pawan Kumar viral in the society; that the complainant party agreed to pay Rs.15 lakh and also paid Rs.20,000/- in cash at the spot, alongwith one gold '*Kara*', as a security.

There are serious allegations against the petitioner that he alongwith the co-accused entered the house of the complainant and extorted Rs.20,000/- and one gold '*Kara*' from him.

Keeping in view the nature and gravity of the offence, this Court finds that the petitioner is required for custodial interrogation.

Therefore, finding no merit in the present petition, the same is dismissed.

28.04.2022

parveen kumar

**(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE**

Whether reasoned/speaking?

Yes/No

Whether reportable?

Yes/No