

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

206

**Neutral Citation No.:2023:PHHC:073234
CRM-M-21273-2023
Date of Decision:19.05.2023**

Mamta

.....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK GUPTA

Present:- Mr. Chander Shekhar Singhal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Parveen Kumar Aggarwal, DAG, Haryana.

DEEPAK GUPTA, J.

Prayer in this petition is for grant of anticipatory bail under Section 438 Cr.P.C in case FIR No.154 dated 21.03.2023 registered under Section 370 of the IPC and Section 3, 4, 5, 6 of Immoral Traffic Act, 1956 registered at Police Station Mahesh Nagar, District Ambala.

2. FIR was lodged by Inspector/SHO Rampal Singh on 21.03.2023 as per which a secret information was received to the effect that petitioner and co-accused were indulging in the profession of prostitution; that they had called some girls from outside and were charging commission. The bogus customers were arranged. In the meantime, Deputy Commissioner also reached at the spot. Currency notes of ₹500/- each were given to two bogus customers who were sent to the house of the petitioner. She demanded money. Co-accused Veena, Seema and Vikas were arrested from

the spot.

3. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that she has been falsely implicated; that co-accused Veena, Seema and Vikas had already been allowed regular bail by the Court of Learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ambala; that no person was found in compromising position; that petitioner was not even present at her house and that alleged two ladies were social workers.

4. Opposing the bail petition, learned State counsel pointed out towards the reply filed on behalf of respondent-State in the form of affidavit of Shri Rajneesh Kumar, HPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police Ambala Cantt, as per which the recovered girls namely Sonia, Parmila, Amandeep Kaur, Rekha Nitu, Sapna, Indira, Laxmi and witnesses Sonia, Parmila made statements to the effect that petitioner along with others used to run the brothel.

5. Learned State counsel also pointed out towards the statements made by girls Sonia and Amandeep Kaur recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C. wherein also they named petitioner and co-accused to get the wrong work done from them.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner has placed on record copy of affidavit dated 10.04.2023 of Sonia to contend that her statement was taken by the police forcibly.

7. Having considered submissions of both the sides, this Court does not deem it fit for grant of anticipatory bail considering the statements

CRM-M-21273-2023

of two girls made before Magistrate under Section 164 Cr.P.C. revealing the name of the petitioner and others to be indulging in running a brothel. Custodial interrogation of the petitioner may be required for conducting further investigation in the matter.

8. As such, without commenting anything further on the merits of the case, present petition is hereby rejected.

9. Disposed of accordingly.

May 19, 2023

Neetika Tuteja

(DEEPAK GUPTA)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No