



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

**CRM-M No.22782 of 2025
Date of Decision: 30.04.2025**

Khuspreet Kaur @ Khushi

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. P. K. S. Phoolka, Advocate
for the petitioner.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J.

1. Present second petition has been filed praying for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.115 (Annexure P-1), dated 11.09.2024, under Sections 308(2), 61(2), 351 of BNS, 2023, registered at Police Station Kotwali Bathinda, District Bathinda, Punjab. Further prayer has been made for staying the arrest of the petitioner during the pendency of the present petition.

2. From the perusal of the record, it is evident that the petitioner had earlier approached this Court praying for the grant of anticipatory bail by way of filing CRM-M No.53281 of 2024. As this Court does not agree with the same, hence the petition was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 25.10.2024 with liberty to the petitioner to surrender before the learned trial Court within a period of 02 weeks to



enable her to file the regular bail. However the petitioner did not surrender before the learned trial Court and thus approached before the learned trial Court again disobeying the order of this Court praying for the grant of anticipatory bail, which was dismissed vide order dated 02.12.2024. Hence the petitioner approached this Court again by way of filing the present petition praying for the grant of bail.

3. As per the facts of the case, the FIR was lodged on the statement of complainant, namely, Sandeep Singh. It was alleged that on 10.09.2024, he came from Rohtak to Sirsa for purchasing a plot. He was going to Hanumangarh via Bathinda by train. When the train reached Bathinda Junction, he came out of the platform for having the dinner. He met 02 ladies standing near the Dhaba. They allured him and he went with them. There they made his objectionable video on their mobile phone and then threatened him to pay Rs.50,000/-, failing which, they would viral his video. Thus by blackmailing him, they took Rs.50,000/- through *Paytm* from his mobile. Thereafter he came to know that those two ladies, who blackmailing him, were Jaspreet Kaur @ Jassi and Khuspreet Kaur @ Khushi, i.e. the petitioner. He made a request to take the legal action against both the ladies. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. Apprehending her arrest, the petitioner earlier approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Bathinda praying for the grant of anticipatory bail. However after hearing both the sides, finding no merit in the same, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Bathinda dismissed the petition filed by the petitioner vide his



order dated 09.10.2024. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner earlier approached this Court by way of filing CRM-M-53281-2024 which was allowed to be dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 25.10.2024 with liberty to the petitioner to surrender before the learned trial Court within a period of two weeks to enable her to file regular bail, however she did not surrender before the learned trial Court. Rather instead of, she again approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Bathinda praying for the grant of anticipatory bail, which was declined vide order dated 02.12.2024. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner is again before this Court by way of filing the present second petition praying for the grant of anticipatory bail.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He has submitted that neither any money has been received by the petitioner nor the same has transferred in the account of the petitioner through any *Paytm*. He has submitted that no prima facie case as alleged against the petitioner is made out and the petitioner is ready to join the investigation.

5. Heard.

6. On hearing learned counsel for the petitioner and perusing the record, it is apparent that the petitioner earlier approached this Court praying for the grant of anticipatory bail by way of filing CRM-M-53281-2024, however when this Court does not agree with the petitioner, then she was allowed to withdraw her earlier petition with liberty to surrender before the learned trial Court within two weeks. Instead of



surrendering before the learned trial Court, the petitioner again approached the learned trial Court for grant of bail, which was also dismissed. On the same ground, the petitioner is again before this Court.

7. Thus this Court neither find any change in the circumstances nor find any merit in the present second petition filed by the petitioner. Resultantly, the present second petition being devoid of any merit is hereby dismissed. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

30.04.2025		(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
<i>rittu</i>		JUDGE
	Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes/No
	Whether reportable :	Yes/No