

208 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-25561-2022 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 23.11.2022

RAVI KUMAR

... PETITIONER

V/S

STATE OF PUNJAB

... RESPONDENT

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIVEK PURI**

Present: Mr. Rahul Arora, Advocate for the petitioner.  
Ms. Ruchika Sabherwal, DAG Punjab.  
Mr. Dinesh Trehan, Advocate for the complainant.

\* \* \*

**VIVEK PURI, J. (ORAL)**

On 29.08.2022 following order was passed:

“Petitioner is seeking anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No. 73 dated 13.04.2022 under Sections 354, 323, 34 IPC, registered at Police Station Guru Harsahai, District Ferozepur (Section 354-B, 452 IPC and Section 67 of Information Technology Act added later on).

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that initially the allegations were only with regard to the commission of offence under Sections 323, 354 read with Section 34 IPC. The offence under Section 354 B, 452 IPC and 67 of Information Technology Act have been added later on, as a result of afterthought, on the basis of the supplementary statement of the complainant. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that neither any obscene video of the complainant has been prepared nor uploaded by the petitioner.

Learned State counsel also submits that the petitioner is not depicted in the video that has been prepared by the co-accused namely Kaku @ Rohit.

Adjourned to 23.11.2022.

Meanwhile, the petitioner shall join the investigation and

would come present as and when called for and in the event of arrest, the petitioner shall be admitted to interim bail on his furnishing personal and surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting/Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall also abide by the conditions as specified under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.”

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has joined the investigation in pursuance of the interim directions issued by this Court.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Gehna Ram, has not disputed the aforesaid factual aspect and has stated that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required.

Considering above, the petition is allowed and the interim bail granted by this Court vide order dated 29.08.2022 is made absolute.

The petition stands allowed.

23.11.2022

Janki

(VIVEK PURI)  
JUDGE

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