

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

**CRM-M No.36787 of 2022
Date of Decision: 31.10.2022**

Ravi Kumar

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

BEFORE: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA

Present:- Mr. L.K. Gollen, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Apoorv Garg, DAG, Haryana.

MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA, J.(Oral)

The petitioner herein has sought the relief of regular bail in the criminal case arisen out of the FIR bearing No.275 dated 28.08.2018 registered at Police Station Civil Lines Jind, District Jind, under Sections 406, 420, 506 read with Section 120-B IPC (the offences under Sections 468, 470, 471, 495 and 496 IPC are stated to have been deleted during the investigation), with the allegations that he, along-with his co-accused, had been indulging in bringing the girls from Punjab and getting them married in the local area in lieu of money and thereafter, blackmailing the families of the bridegrooms.

2. Status-report submitted on behalf of the respondent-State, by

way of the affidavit of Deputy Superintendent of Police (Law and Order), Jind, is already available on the file and the same is taken on the record.

3. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel in the present petition and have also perused the file carefully.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner had no role to play in the alleged crime and rather, he has been got falsely implicated in the instant case and he had never induced anyone to pay money to him in lieu of providing the bride for the marriage and in these circumstances, he deserves the relief as prayed for in this petition.

5. Per contra, learned State counsel argues that the petitioner had also received several cheques from the complainants and had encashed the same and he, along-with his co-accused, had been blackmailing the families of the bridegrooms and keeping in view the nature of the offence, this petition be dismissed.

6. In para No.4 in the Status-report, it has categorically been deposed that the petitioner had withdrawn the amounts by encashing the cheques as detailed therein, meaning thereby that he was also a beneficiary and had actively participated in the alleged crime. To add to it, in para No.9 therein, it has specifically been mentioned that besides the present case, the petitioner has remained involved in three more criminal cases as registered against him under Section 174-A IPC and out of the same, he has already been convicted in one case and is facing trial in another case, although he is reported to have been acquitted in the third one.

7. Keeping in view the above-discussed facts and circumstances as well as the nature of the offence as committed by the petitioner, this Court is of the considered opinion that he (petitioner) does not deserve the relief of regular bail. Resultantly, the petition in hand stands dismissed accordingly.

8. However, it is clarified that nothing contained here-in-before shall be construed to be an expression of the opinion of this Court on the merits of the case.

October 31, 2022

pooja

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned:</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Whether Reportable:</i>	<i>No</i>