

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

CRM-M-3375-2025

Date of Decision:- 20.02.2025

NAVDEEP KAUR

....Petitioner

Vs.

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI

Present:- Mr. Parminder Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Gautam Thapar, AAG, Punjab.

AMARJOT BHATTI, J.

1. Petitioner has filed instant petition under Section 482 BNSS, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No. 158 dated 18.07.2024 under Sections 376, 420 and 120-B IPC registered at Police Station Jamalpur, Ludhiana, District Ludhiana.

2. Facts of the case, prosecutrix gave her statement that she is 24 years lady and is uneducated. She is having two brothers with whom she is not on talking terms. Her mother expired during her childhood. Her father had five children from first marriage and out of them one of her step sister left her with a lady namely Daljit Kaur about 7-8 years ago when she was 15-16 years of age. Said lady was residing in Kochar Market Ludhiana. She used to do cleaning work. She worked for her for about 13-14 months and thereafter she introduced her with



Navdeep Kaur and she worked for her for about 2-3 months. Since her mother had already expired, she started calling Navdeep Kaur as mother. She performed her marriage with Chand. On the very first day, her husband left her at the house of Navdeep Kaur and at night time Chintu husband of Navdeep Kaur raped her. On the next day, her husband Chand returned and she disclosed this fact to her husband who in return consoled her. Thereafter, she along with Chintu went to Amritsar for 2-3 days and on return she was again left at the house of Navdeep where again she was raped by said Chintu. Other girls used to visit house of Navdeep and she tried to involve her in this wrong business. She disclosed this fact to her husband who in return states that she can earn more money and they can construct a house of their own. Navdeep Kaur used to send her in a Hotel Jai Cruise, Chandigarh Road near Samrala Chowk, Ludhiana where Chintu husband of Navdeep used to work at reception. Said Chintu did wrongful act with her time and again. He also tried to put her on drug. Money was kept by Chintu. She wanted to get out of this business. Thereafter, she started working in saloon for about 7-8 months. They kept on sending her to a hotel for these wrongful activities. They again sent her to Sai palace Jammu through broker Rahul whose complete name she did not know. She was involved in this work for about 1 year 3 months. Thereafter, she came to Ludhiana and started residing in the house of Navdeep. She had invested money in a committee worth about Rs.11 lakhs which was withdrawn by Navdeep. She asked about her money but she was given

Rs.1 lakh and on the stamp paper she wrote Rs.1.5 lakhs. Thereafter,



she went to her father and narrated the whole occurrence. Thereafter, they tried to contact the aforesaid accused persons but they avoided to talk to her and even abused her. With these allegations, present FIR has been registered.

3. Learned counsel for petitioner argued that all allegations levelled against present petitioner are false. There is a long delay in lodging the FIR. A false case has been registered to extract money. No offence is made out against the petitioner under Sections 420, 120-B and 376 of IPC. She is ready to join the investigation. Therefore, her bail may be allowed.

4. Bail application is opposed by learned counsel representing State. Detailed status report has been filed confirming the facts detailed in the FIR. It is argued that present petitioner is the main accused who exploited the prosecutrix by forcing her to get involved in immoral activities in order to earn money. At the time of alleged occurrence, prosecutrix was a young girl and she has been misused by the petitioner along with other co-accused. Investigation of the case is at initial stage. Custodial interrogation of petitioner is required. Therefore, she is not entitled to be released on anticipatory bail.

5. I have considered the arguments and have gone through the record carefully. There are specific serious allegations against petitioner who initially involved the prosecutrix in immoral activities for a long duration. She was forced to go to different hotels by giving allurements of money. Other co-accused are also involved in the commission of this offence. Facts narrated in the FIR indicate that



money dispute also took place between them. Matter requires thorough investigation. Therefore, considering the gravity of offence and the manner in which it has been committed, I do not find a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail and the same is, accordingly, declined.

6. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stand disposed of accordingly as well.

(AMARJOT BHATTI)
JUDGE

20.02.2025
snd

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