



102

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

**CRM-M-15367-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 21.03.2025**

Jaswant Singh

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Ms. Riffi Birla, Advocate for
Mr. Ritesh Grover, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Subhash Godara, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.176 dated 29.11.2024 under Sections 308(2), 351(1)(3), 127(7), 61(2), 231 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 [*erstwhile Sections 384, 503, 506, 347, 120-B, 196 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short 'IPC')*], registered at Police Station City Fazilka, District Fazilka.

2. Briefly, the facts of the case are that FIR (*supra*) was registered on



the basis of statement made by the complainant on 29.11.2024 on the allegations that co-accused Kajal allured him with seducing talk and on 28.11.2024, he met her at the gate of grain market and along with his worker Hemant Singh, followed her two wheeler, in his car. After parking his car in a vacant plot in Dera Sacha Sauda Colony, Fazilka, he went inside the room of a house and co-accused Kajal enticed him. Thereafter, two ladies and two youths entered the room and forcibly removed his clothes and co-accused Kajal also removed her clothes and a video was prepared. On being protested by the complainant, the youths gave slaps to him, snatched Rs.10,000/- from his pocket and his mobile phone and also demanded Rs.10.00 lakhs and threatened him to send the video to his relatives, if their demand was not fulfilled. On the request made the complainant, the accused agreed to receive Rs.3.00 lakhs. In the meantime, the petitioner wearing police uniform entered the room and threatened the complainant to pay Rs.3.00 lakhs within 15-20 minutes, otherwise, he would be implicated in a case under Section 376 of IPC. On the pretext of arranging the money, the complainant along with his worker proceeded towards Fazilka and thereafter, got registered the FIR (*supra*).

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that the petitioner is a govt. employee and he has been falsely implicated in the present case just to harass and malign his reputation, as he was in relationship with co-accused Manjeet Kaur, who has already been granted the concession of regular

2025:PHHC:038864



bail by learned trial Court vide order dated 18.01.2025 (Annexure P-2). In fact, the petitioner has a *prima facie alibi* and he was present elsewhere at the time of incident. The complainant is around 62 years old and the petitioner is only 39 years of age and at the best, an attempt was made to extort money. In fact, no extortion has taken place. Till date, the investigating agency has not added the offence of snatching. It is further contended that another co-accused Swaran Kaur @ Suman has also been granted the concession of anticipatory bail by learned trial Court vide order dated 10.01.2025 (Annexure P-4). The petitioner is having clean antecedents and he is not involved in any other case.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel appears on advance notice and opposes the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner, in connivance with other co-accused, induced the complainant to come to a secluded place and thereafter, he was taken to a private residence and his clothes were removed and co-accused Kajal @ Sita Rani also removed her clothes and an offending video was prepared and in order to extort money, the petitioner wearing the police uniform came there and he demanded Rs.10.00 lakhs from the complainant, otherwise, his video would be circulated and he would be framed in a case under Section 376 of IPC. As such, in view of seriousness of the crime, the petitioner is not entitled to any relief.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record



of the case with their able assistance.

6. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and the allegations levelled against the petitioner, without commenting further on merits of the case, lest it may prejudice the rights of either of the parties, this Court finds no ground to grant him the concession of anticipatory bail.

7. Accordingly, present petition is dismissed.

[HARPREET SINGH BRAR]
JUDGE

21.03.2025
vishnu

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No