

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

104(1)

CRM-M-19999-2022

Mehakjot Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

104(2)

CRM-M-20023-2022

Manpreet Kaur

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

Date of Decision:11.05.2022

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ.

Present: Mr. Arjinder Singh Sidhu, Advocate,
for the petitioner in CRM-M-19999-2022.

Mr. Kulwinder Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioner in CRM-M-20023-2022.

Ms. Amarjit Kaur Khurana, D.A.G., Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ , J.(Oral)

There are identical points for consideration to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners-Mehakjot Singh and Manpreet Kaur, therefore, I propose to decide the indicated petitions, arising out of the same case/FIR, by means of this common order, to avoid the repetition of facts.

The petitioners have approached this Court under Section 438

of the Code of Criminal Procedure for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.68 dated 10.04.2022 under Sections 384, 34 of the Indian Penal Code, registered at Police Station City-2, Mansa, District Mansa.

The case of the prosecution was set in motion on the statement of one Gurmeet Singh son of Gurdas Singh who is aged 27 years and has reported to the police that he had a long acquaintance with Sukhchain Singh @ Chaini and that he happened to meet Sandeep Kaur widow of Sukhchain Singh. She apprised that one of her friends namely Manpreet Kaur(**petitioner in CRM-M-20023-2022**) deals with visas for sending people abroad and that she informed the complainant that she will have a word with Manpreet Kaur regarding the same on behalf of the complainant. On 09.04.2022, the complainant made a phone call to Sandeep Kaur and she forwarded the mobile number of the complainant to Manpreet Kaur. A call was received by the complainant from Manpreet Kaur and she called the complainant to her house in Mansa. The complainant went inside and two ladies were found to be present there in the house. One of them introduced herself as Manpreet Kaur and she took the complainant inside the room. She called another lady by the name of Sukhdeep Kaur and asked her to bring the water. When the said Sukhdeep Kaur had gone to fetch the water, Manpreet Kaur(**petitioner in CRM-M-20023-2022**) started doing obscene acts with the complainant and forcibly hugged him. When the complainant started to oppose the abovesaid acts, two boys and Sandeep Kaur came in. The names of both boys were Mehakjot Singh(petitioner herein) and Kuldeep. Sandeep Kaur asked the boys as to whether the videos in question have been recorded or not whereupon Kuldeep apprised that the same stands recorded. Thereafter, Sukhdeep Kaur also came inside. It is alleged that all

of them started threatening the complainant and snatched his mobile phone and threatened that they will send the recorded videos to the family members of the complainant unless an amount of ₹25 lakhs was paid. The complainant negotiated the settlement for a sum of ₹10 lakh. Sandeep Kaur is alleged to have taken his purse as a surety and handed it over to Manpreet Kaur(**petitioner herein in CRM-M-20023-2022**).

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner-Mehakjot Singh is not attributed any specific role and that the co-accused Kuldeep who has been attributed the role at par with the petitioner, was granted regular bail.

Insofar as the submission on behalf of learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner-Manpreet Kaur, is concerned, it is alleged that the petitioner has no role in the incident in question and that she never demanded any amount from the complainant. It is further pointed out that the co-accused Sandeep Kaur has been granted the concession of *interim bail* vide order dated 02.05.2022 in CRM-M -18380-2022.

I have considered the rival submissions advanced on behalf of the respective parties.

Insofar as the case of the petitioner-Mehakjot Singh(in **CRM-M-19999-2022**) is concerned, the same is at par with that of co-accused Kuldeep who was arrested and granted regular bail. It is not in dispute that the petitioner along with the co-accused had indulged in video recording of the incident and thereafter, extending threats to facilitate extortion.

Referring to the allegations against the petitioner-Manpreet Kaur, it is evident that she was the one who indulged in facilitating recording of the videos by doing obscene acts with the complainant. The

active connivance of the petitioners is well reflected and that they have facilitated initiation of the extortion so as to intimidate the complainant to pay money. The role of the petitioners would be distinct and differentiable as compared to Sandeep Kaur and Sukhdeep Kaur. Sofar as Sandeep Kaur is concerned, she is alleged to have introduced the complainant to Manpreet Kaur and to have thereafter called the accused Kuldeep and Mehakjot Singh. The role attributed to her at best was to induce the complainant to fall in a trap, whereas Sukhdeep Kaur was present at the house and had been sent to bring water for the complainant and she came in only after the entire incident has occurred. Hence, the role of the said two women is at variance with the petitioners herein, who had actively indulged and involved themselves in the commission of offence in question.

In view thereof, the petitioners do not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail inasmuch as the said nature of cases are on the rise where the labeled persons are induced by women to extort money. The social repercussions of such incidents are immense and have led to numerous social fall outs for the victims. Besides, the custodial interrogation of the petitioners would also be required in order to ascertain as to in how many such or similar other cases, they have indulged and actually extorted money as well.

The instant petitions are accordingly dismissed.

May 11, 2022
seema

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No