



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

101

CRM-M-6570-2026
Date of decision: 16.02.2026

SARABJIT KAUR

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present: - Mr. Randeep Singh Gill, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Dr. (Ms.) Savi Nagpal, Asst. A.G. Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The present first petition has been filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 for grant of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.02 dated 05.01.2026, under Sections 127(2), 308(2), 351(2), 61(2) of BNS, 2023 registered at Police Station Sherpur, District Sangrur.

2. The FIR in the present case has been registered on the statement of Gurchet Singh son of Lal Singh. The allegations levelled in the FIR reads thus:-

“I run a Jewellery shop in the name of Sandura Jewellers in Sherpur. On 01/06/2025, I was present at my shop, when at around 2 pm Sarabjit Kaur wife of Gurpreet Singh

resident of Sherpur, who told me her name herself, came to my shop and after seeing the gold and silver ornaments from me, she left. After about 5-7 days she again came to my shop and told me that my friend Harjit Kaur wife of Jagtar Singh who lives in Suncity Colony Sherpur has to sell her house and saying this she left my shop and after that she keep texting me from her mobile phone 62394-24224 to my mobile phone 94174-65600 on WhatsApp. Then on 20-06-2025, I got a call from Sarabjit Kaur, she asked me to come to Suncity Colony and see the house, so on Sarabjit Kaur's request, I went to the address given in Suncity Colony. Before my arrival, Sinder Kaur wife of Sukhpal Singh, Harjit Kaur wife of Jagtar Singh and one unknown person, aged about 30, whom I can recognize when I comes across him, were present in Harjit Kaur's house and Sarabjit Kaur herself asked me to come inside the house. Then Sarabjit Kaur took me inside the house, where all three Sinder Kaur, Harjit Kaur and the unknown person came inside the room, who forcibly removed my clothes and also took my mobile and motorcycle keys from me and the unknown person started making my obscene video with his own mobile phone. After making my obscene video, these four started threatening me that either give us 10 lakh rupees otherwise we will go to your shop and will make your obscene video public and will also file a case against you. They kept me captive in the house for about three hours. Then a deal was made for 2 lakh rupees for not making the obscene video public. At the same time, Sinder Kaur got 50 thousand rupees from me through my phone number 94174-65600 to her phone number 62842-63392 on Google Pay. While threatening and saying me that I shall give her 1.5 lakh rupees in a day or two, she gave me my mobile and motorcycle keys and left. Then on 23-06-2025, Sinder Kaur and her son Hussan came to my shop and took 1.5 lakh rupees from me and threatened me not to speak to anyone regarding this otherwise my fate will be bad. I took the said 1.5 lakh rupees on interest from my village Jagsir Singh alias Lali, son of Sarbagh

Singh, after telling him all the above. I will submit the written statement regarding this to you. After that, Sinder Kaur continued to spread slander against me in the village, due to which I did not speak out of fear and thought it appropriate to remain silent. Even after that, Sinder Kaur, continued to spread slander against me and kept saying in the village that she would take 2 lakh rupees more from Gurchet and then only she will spare me. Above said has formed a gang who take innocent people under their spell and collect money, against whom a case has already been registered at the city police station, Barnala district, for doing the same. Earlier I did not speak because of shame, now when i was coming to the police station to report this incident, you have met me. Sinder Kaur and others have conspired together to make my obscene video public and threaten me and have snatched 2 lakh rupees from me, legal action should be taken against Sinder Kaur and others.”

3. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the aforesaid case alongwith co-accused Shinder Kaur and Harjeet Kaur. He contends that the petitioner had in fact sold her jewellery items to the respondent-complainant and when she demanded the money back, the present case has been foisted upon her. It is alleged that co-accused Shinder Kaur has already been granted concession of regular bail. He further contends that there is a delay of 07 months in registration of FIR which clearly shows that it is a case of false implication against the petitioner. He contends that the money in question had not been received by the petitioner and the same was given to Shinder Kaur, hence, no recovery of any nature is to be effected from the petitioner. Therefore, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required. He further contends that the petitioner as well as the complainant belong to Zamin Prapti

Sangrash Committee and that on account of the *inter se* power-struggle between the members of the Committee, the present FIR has been got registered against the petitioner by the rival group.

4. Learned State Counsel, on the other hand, contends that the petitioner is the person who allured the complainant into the house by a honey trap and was instrumental in getting the objectionable videos recorded. She contends that delay in registration of such cases is inconsequential as usually people try to resolve such disputes mutually and it is only when the pressure becomes onerous that a person goes to the Police authorities to report such incidents. Therefore, delay in registration of FIR should not weigh in favour of the petitioner. She further contends that the fact that the petitioner is involved in another similar case pertaining to honey trap qua which FIR No. 363 dated 08.08.2025 have been registered clearly shows that it is regular *modus operandi* for the petitioner.

5. I have heard learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the parties and have gone through the documents appended alongwith the present petition.

6. The present case is a case of honey trap whereby victim was allured into a vacant house where his objectionable videos were recorded and then the demand was raised for money to be paid, failing which the videos shall be circulated within the town. The contention of the petitioner that the co-accused has been granted bail would not come to her aid as the said co-accused Shinder Kaur was granted regular bail and not an anticipatory bail. Besides, the petitioner has been raising the contradictory pleas. In her first contention about false implication, it was contended that she sold her gold ornaments to the complainant and was demanding her

money back and for the said reason has been falsely implicated, however, in the second version, the Counsel for the petitioner has contended that the rival group of Zamin Prapti Sangarsh Committee has set up the respondent-complainant to get false FIR registered against the petitioner. The version being put forth by the petitioner is not corroborated by any evidence. There is no direct link to suggest that petitioner is being falsely implicated. The respondent-complainant had specifically named the petitioner to be the person who allured him to enter into the house and hence, the petitioner actively participated in extortion of the respondent-complainant. Her involvement in similar offences clearly shows that she is habitual offender. The petitioner thus, does not deserve concession of pre-arrest bail.

The present petition is accordingly **dismissed**.

FEBRUARY 16, 2026
Vishal Sharma

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No