

CNR No. PBSG01003980-2020

BA -1810 -2020

Raj Rani etc. Versus State.

FIR No.198 of 06.06.2020.

U/s 384, 506 and 120B IPC.

Police Station: City Sangrur.

Present: Shri G. S. Sarao, Advocate, counsel for applicants Raj Rani and Baljit Kaur.
Shri Janpreet Sharma, Additional PP for the State assisted by
Shri P. S. Rattan, Advocate counsel for complainant.

ORDER

This is an application filed by the applicants -accused under Section 438 Cr.P.C, for releasing them on anticipatory bail.

2. The learned Additional PP for the State, on receipt of notice, put in appearance and produced the record.

3. I have heard the learned Counsel for applicants, Additional PP for the State and also perused the record.

4. It is submitted by the applicants as well as argued by their counsel that It is argued that the complainant came in contact of applicant no.1. They started residing as husband and wife. The complainant also promised to maintain applicant no.1 and her minor son Jasprit Singh. When, applicant no.1 asked complainant for some money for making her house, the complainant filed the application with false allegations. No offence has been committed by the applicants. They have been falsely

implicated in the present case only to avoid his liability. Their physical custody is not required. The police is raiding the house of applicants to arrest them. They are ready to join the investigation as and when so directed and will abide by all the conditions imposed by the Court. Hence, the prayer for relief of anticipatory bail.

5. On the other hand, while controverting his contentions, the learned Additional PP for the State has vehemently argued that the applicants have extorted a handsome amount from the complainant. As allegations against the applicants are grave in nature, they do not deserve the leniency of the Court in grant of relief of anticipatory bail.

6. The FIR in the present case was got lodged on the basis of enquiry conducted on the application moved by Jaswant Singh against Sukhwinder Kaur wife of Bant Singh, Bant Singh, Raj Rani @ Komal and Baljit Kaur for the offences punishable under Sections 384, 506 and 120B IPC. Allegedly, complainant Jaaswant Singh is an old person of the age of 66 years. He is not keeping good health. About 9-10 months ago, he came in contact of Sukhwinder Kaur, her husband Bant Singh through his (complainant's) relative Sukhdev Singh. After a few days, again he came across Sukhwinder kaur and her husband Bant Singh at Sangrur, who took her along at the residence of Raj Rani @ Komal. Raj Rani and her mother Baljit Kaur were also present there. Raj Rani was living with her mother due to her strained relations with her husband. He also came to know that husband of Baljit kaur was residing in some unknown Dera. It is alleged

that in pursuance of conspiracy, hatched by all four of them, Raj Rani @ Komal, her mother Baljit Kaur, Sukhwinder Kaur and Bant Singh served him (complainant) with some drink mixed with intoxicating substance. He came under the influence of intoxicating substance. During that period, Sukhwinder Kaur took her to a room in the house of Raj Kaur and started taking his photographs after stripping him off. They threatened to circulate the objectionable photographs, if he raised a noise. Under the threat of blackmailing him, all four above named persons extorted Rs.24,80,000/- from him from time to time. Despite repeated reminders, the accused did not join the process of enquiry. After registration of FIR, the investigation was carried.

7. The learned Counsel for the complainant has placed on record statement of account of complainant, perusal of which reveals the payment made by the complainant. He has also produced copies of affidavits of Suresh Kumar, Karamjit Singh, Pargat Singh and Amrik Singh, from whom the complainant borrowed money to pay the same to the accused. The allegations against the present applicants are grave in nature and make essential their custodial interrogation. So far the averments/contentions of the learned counsel for applicants are concerned, those are matters to be appreciated only after taking evidence during trial. At this stage, it is too early to jump to any conclusion for the purpose of pre - arrest bail. The matter is still pending investigation and challan is yet to be presented. Therefore, there is every likelihood that if

granted bail, the applicants may attempt to hamper the process of the investigation in one way or the other. Moreover, it would not communicate a right signal to the society. Without commenting much on the merits of the case and keeping in view of the seriousness of allegations against the present applicants, no exceptional circumstances are made out at this stage to attract the provision under Section 438 Cr.P.C for granting pre-arrest bail to the present applicants. Consequently, the bail application is **dismissed**.

Police record be returned. Bail papers be consigned to the Record Room, Sangrur.

Announced in open Court.

Dated: 23.06.2020.

Rajiv Kumar, JW.

(Dr. Rajneesh)
Additional Sessions Judge,
Sangrur (UID-PB0172) (Duty)

Certified that the order has been directly dictated by the undersigned.

Dr. Rajneesh
Additional Sessions Judge,
Sangrur (UID-PB0172) (Duty)