

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No. 42175 of 2023
Reserved on:-13.12.2023
Pronounced on:- 20.12.2023

PALA RAM

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

... Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present:- Mr. Ram Singh Chaudhary, Advocate,
for the petitioner

Mr. Vishal Malik, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. P.S. Jammu, Advocate for the complainant.

.....

SANJIV BERRY, J (ORAL)

By way of the present petition filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C
the petitioner is praying for anticipatory bail in the event of arrest in FIR
(Annexure P-2) detailed as under:-

FIR No.	Dated	Sections	Police Station
299	05.07.2023	384, 399, 34 of IPC	Agroha, District Hisar

2. It is *inter alia* contended by learned counsel for the petitioner
that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case.
He submits that the allegations levelled by the prosecution against the

petitioner are that he in connivance with some lady were indulged in extortion of money after laying honey trap. He submits that the allegations against the petitioner are manifestly wrong as he has no concern whatsoever with the alleged lady. Infact petitioner has sold his tractor to Ramesh and the copy of photograph is annexed as Annexure P-4. He also submits that said Ramesh is his relative who is from his village. He submits that the instant FIR has been lodged in order to harass the petitioner, as such he prays for grant of concession of bail to the petitioner.

3. Per contra, learned State counsel has opposed the bail application by arguing that the petitioner happens to be kingpin of the honey trap racket being run by him along with co-accused Anju. He submits that the petitioner had been making extortion calls to the complainant on the pretext of making their obscene video viral and they have extracted more than ₹4,50,000/- from the complainants in this case. He submits that no such transaction pertaining to tractor has taken place as alleged by the petitioner. He submits that it has come during investigation that the petitioner had called Ramesh 23 times on 23.12.2023 when Ramesh transferred ₹1,25,000/- to him and similarly Sukhdev paid ₹80,000/-. He submits that the petitioner gave the mobile phone to co-accused Anju and has since been arrested and the mobile phone from the petitioner is to be recovered. Learned counsel for the State by referring to the reply dated 13.09.2023 submitted by Deputy Superintendent of Police, Hisar-II, Hisar to state that during investigation it transpires that complainant Ramesh had to pay ₹1,50,000/- to the petitioner on 15.07.2023 besides getting ₹1,00,000/- transferred from account of his cousin Shamsher and ₹25,000/- from his

friend Mukesh when the petitioner threatened him on telephone. He submits that these amounts were transferred in the bank account of the petitioner. He further submits that during investigation it has come that the complainant Sukhdev had to pay ₹80,000/- to petitioner on the basis of extortion made by the petitioner. He submits that the petitioner is not having clean antecedents and as such he prays for dismissal of the petition.

4. Learned counsel for the complainant has also assailed the arguments raised by the learned counsel for the petitioner to say that the petitioner along with co-accused had been running honey trap racket whereby he used to get obscene video recorded and then used to threaten the persons to make the video viral unless hefty amount was paid and the complainant happens to be one of the victims, as such he prays for dismissal of the bail petition.

5. From the perusal of the record, it transpires that the instant FIR was registered against the petitioner along with others, moved by the complainant Ramesh and Sukhdev alleging that a gang for extortion of money by giving threats to make obscene video viral is being operated by petitioner Palaram along with mischievous lady and a police employee Vinod Dhayal and they have extorted more than ₹4.5 lacs from them by blackmailing them and on the basis of such complaint an FIR was registered.

6. After Considering the rival contentions and perusing the record it transpires that there are categoric allegations against the petitioner of running honey trap racket along with co-accused Anju. During the investigation certain transactions were revealed whereby complainant paid money to the petitioner both in cash and in bank account. There is specific

reply filed by the State to the effect that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required for recovery of mobile phone from him which was used for the purpose of recording videos. There are other criminal cases registered against the petitioner.

7. In these circumstances, considering the nature and gravity of the offence, it is observed that no case is made out in favour of the petitioner for grant of anticipatory bail, as a consequent the petition is hereby dismissed.

8. Any observation made above shall not be construed as opinion of this Court on the merits of the case.

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

20.12.2023

Gyan

i)	Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
ii)	Whether reportable?	Yes/No