

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

CRM-M-19150-2020

Date of Decision: 17.07.2020

Paramjeet Kaur

....Petitioner.

Versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL

Present: Mr. Rajvir Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Suvir Sehgal, J.

Court has been convened through Video Conferencing due to Covid-19 pandemic.

Instant petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.28 dated 05.02.2020 under Sections 354 and 354-A IPC (Offence under Sections 384 and 120-B IPC added later on) and Section 8 of Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012, registered at Police Station City Rupnagar, District Rupnagar.

Briefly stated, the facts of the case are that a written complaint was given by a 16 years old girl wherein she stated that about three years ago when she was studying in Sahibzada Ajit Singh Academy and she was staying with her parents on rent in the house of Paramjit Singh, his son Jatinder Singh attempted to rape her. When she went for tuition to the house of Madam Supriya, she used to force her to drink, smoke and even administered her some injections. Madam Supriya made an obscene video of her (victim), blackmailed her and demanded money as well as jewellery

from her. The victim has particularly narrated an incident when she was asked to steal jewellery from her house on the occasion of *Karwa Chauth*. Madam Supriya had uploaded the video in a group of which Jaspreet Singh Bains, Manjinder Singh @ Bittu, Jaswinder Singh, Jatinder Singh and Paramjeet Kaur @ Simran (present petitioner) were members. She stated that all the accused used to threaten to molest her and were extracting money from her. She stated that she did not report the incident earlier because she was scared that her parents will reprimand her. The statement of victim was recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C.

Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated. According to the counsel, the petitioner is an unmarried girl aged 26 years and is working as a computer operator in a private hospital. Counsel submitted that petitioner has nothing to do with the allegations in the FIR. The petitioner used to teach the complainant after finishing her job in a private hospital and the father of the complainant used to drop and pick up the complainant from the house of the petitioner at around 10 PM every night. It has been further submitted that petitioner gave tuition classes to the complainant for about 2/3 months. Reliance has been placed upon order dated 20.02.2020 (Annexure P2) whereby interim bail was granted by this Court to co-accused in CRM-M-7643-2020.

I have considered the submission of counsel for the petitioner.

The FIR has been registered on the statement of a 16 years old girl that implicates the petitioner. The accused including the petitioner used to threaten her as a result of which, she was so scared that for three years she did not even report the incident to her parents. The victim is now

mentally unstable and this could probably be the result of the trauma that she has gone through in her growing years at the hands of petitioner and other co-accused.

The argument of the counsel for the petitioner that petitioner had no access to the house of complainant stands belied because petitioner's mother was working as a maid at the house of the victim. Furthermore, the fact that the petitioner was a member of the group where the objectionable video was circulated makes her accomplice to the offence. The grant of interim bail to the co-accused does not advance the case of the petitioner, who is a sexual predator. The life of a young child has been ruined as a result of the abuse that she has gone through in her formative years.

Considering the gravity of the offence and the fact that the victim was a minor girl of 13 years of age at the time of alleged occurrence, the petitioner is not entitled to the concession of anticipatory bail. There is no merit in the instant petition. The same is accordingly dismissed.

It is clarified that any observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case.

(SUVIR SEHGAL)
JUDGE

17.07.2020

komal

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