



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.45864 of 2024
Date of decision: 30th September, 2024

Vipin Singh
... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana
... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Sahil Chawdhary, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Gagandeep S. Chhina, Asst. Advocate General, Haryana
for the respondent/State.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of bail under Section 482 BNSS in case FIR No.190 dated 30.06.2024 under Sections 34, 384, 506 of the IPC registered at Police Station Sector 31, Faridabad.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case along with other co-accused, for allegedly extorting a sum of more than ₹45 lakhs through a honey-trap scheme involving the complainant. Drawing the Court's attention to the FIR, annexed as Annexure P-1, learned counsel submits that a mere perusal of the FIR reveals no direct allegation against the petitioner. It is argued that the petitioner was implicated solely on the basis of the disclosure statement of the co-accused, the evidentiary value of which is inherently weak.

3. Learned Counsel further submits that all the accusations primarily pertain to co-accused Anita and her husband, who are alleged to have honey-trapped the complainant and coerced him into depositing an amount of approximately ₹15,50,000/-. The petitioner, it is argued, was merely a tenant of co-accused Anita, and the bank transactions in question were initiated by Anita in her capacity as the landlady. The money deposited into the petitioner's account, according to learned counsel, was simply returned to another account belonging to Anita. These transactions, counsel submits, were purely for the purpose of returning the funds sent by Anita, without any criminal intent on the part of the petitioner.

4. Per contra, learned State Counsel, on instructions, has strongly opposed the prayer and the submissions made by the counsel opposite. He contends that the petitioner, along with co-accused Anita and Makkhan Singh, was part of an organized extortion racket, using honey-trapping as a means to threaten and extort innocent people. It is alleged that the petitioner, in collusion with the co-accused, extorted a total of ₹45 lakhs from the complainant. Further, the learned State counsel submits that there is documentary evidence showing the transfer of money from co-accused Anita's account to the petitioner's account, which was later transferred back to another account belonging to Anita. Both the documentary evidence and the disclosure statements of the co-accused, it is argued, clearly indicate to the involvement of the petitioner in the operation of the extortion racket.

5. The learned State counsel has also informed this Court that the anticipatory bail of co-accused Makkhan Singh has already been dismissed by this Court. Moreover, the learned State counsel has asserted that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is essential to fully uncover the modus operandi of the extortion racket.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material on record.

7. Prima facie, there are serious allegations against the petitioner qua his active involvement in a racket that extorted money from innocent people by means of honey trapping. There are further specific allegations that the petitioner personally received ₹15,50,000/- into his own account.

8. In light of the seriousness of these allegations, the Court therefore, does not deem it appropriate to grant the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. The petition stands dismissed. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

September 30, 2024

rps

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No