



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

201 (02 cases)

**CRM-M-28033-2026(O&M)
CRM-M-31814-2026 (O&M)
Date of decision: 16.06.2026**

1. CRM-M-28033-2026

Preeti ...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Haryana ...Respondent(s)

2. CRM-M-31814-2026

Kuldeep Kaur ...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Haryana ...Respondent(s)

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

Present :- Mr. Gaurav Vir Singh Behl, Advocate for the petitioner
in CRM-M-28033-2026.

Mr. Ankit Saini, Advocate for the petitioner
in CRM-M-31814-2026.

Mr. Paras Talwar, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Akshit Aggarwal, Advocate (through V.C) and
Mr. Mahipal S. Yadav, Advocate for the complainant.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

Both these petitions, arising out of the same case bearing FIR No.76 dated 30.04.2026 registered under Sections 308(2) and 61(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 at Police Station Sadar Ambala, District Ambala seeking anticipatory bail to the petitioners, are being decided by a common order.

2. For the facility of reference, brief facts are being referred to from CRM-M-28033-2026 titled as “*Preeti Vs. State of Haryana*”.

3. The FIR in the present case has been registered on the complaint of one Gurmeet Singh to the Office of Superintendent of Police, Ambala

alleging that the petitioner-Preeti (in CRM-M-28033-2026) had submitted a false complaint against his brother Kuldeep Singh and that a demand of Rs.2,75,000/- had been made and on the said payment having been made, the complaint in question was withdrawn. It was further alleged that similarly, another complaint dated 27.11.2025 had been submitted by one Manju Bala against his brother Kuldeep Singh and the said complaint was also withdrawn after obtaining Rs.2,55,000/- through one co-accused Man Singh (non-applicant-already in custody). It was further alleged that even on 07.02.2026, petitioner-Preeti had given a complaint against one Lakhbir Singh and the same was also settled after obtaining Rs.20,000/-. It was accordingly submitted that the petitioners herein have formed a cartel wherein they honeytrap persons and submit complaints alleging sexual harassment/exploitation against the victims and withdraw such complaints on payment of money.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners contend that as a matter of fact, the petitioners are the victims and not the accused. The allegations had been levelled against the petitioners as a counterblast to the case that had been got registered against the brother of the complainant herein. It is further contended that the case in hand is based upon the disclosure statement of the co-accused Manju Bala and Man Singh recorded in the police custody, hence, the same would not be admissible as evidence against them. They further vehemently contend that the allegations are not substantiated at this stage as there is no evidence available on record on the basis whereof parting off with the amount of money as claimed can be established. It is submitted that the respondent-complainant has abused his influence over the police in order to falsely implicate the petitioners herein.

5. Learned State Counsel as well as counsel appearing on behalf of

the complainant submit that the investigation in the present case reveals that there were total of 05 persons, including petitioner-Preeti (in CRM-M-28033-2026), petitioner-Kuldeep Kaur (in CRM-M-31814-2026), Manpreet Kaur, Manju Bala and one Man Singh alongwith one ASI Babli, who was also an accomplice. It is contended that in every complaint submitted by the accused persons alleging sexual harassment/exploitation against different persons, said Man Singh used to act as a mediator and that all such complaints were submitted at the police chowki/station where ASI Babli was posted. It is contended that pursuant to the order passed by this Court, status report dated 02.06.2026 by way of an affidavit of Ajit Singh Shekhawat, IPS, Superintendent of Police, Ambala has been filed, wherein, the specific details and participation as well as the allegations surfacing against the respective petitioners have been summed up. The same reads thus:-

“xxxxxxxx

- i. **First Complaint by the Petitioner in the name of Preeti D/o Jaspal Singh:** On 14.07.2024, the accused-petitioner filed a complaint against Kuldeep Singh at the Women Police Station, Ambala City, in her name as Preeti daughter of Jaspal Singh. This complaint was never formally received or registered at the Police Station and never formed part of any official Police Station record, and thereafter in said complaint compromise was effected through co-accused Maan Singh after receiving Rs. 2,75,000/- (Two Lakh Seventy-Five Thousand rupees);
- ii. **Second Complaint- By co-accused Manju Bala:** On 27.11.2025, co-accused Manju Bala wife of Naresh Kumar, resident of Durga Nagar, filed a complaint against Kuldeep Singh before the Sector-9 Police Station, Ambala. This complaint also was never formally received or registered at the police station, which was similarly compromise for Rs. 2,55,000/- (Two Lakh Fifty-Five Thousand rupees) through

co-accused Maan Singh;

iii. Third Complaint a by the Petitioner in the name of Manpreet D/o Fakir Chand: On 07.02.2026, the accused-petitioner filed a complaint at Police Station Sadar Ambala against Lakhbir Singh Matedi Jatta and Narinder Singh Majri-this time under a completely different name and parentage, namely as Manpreet daughter of Fakir Chand. Unlike the first two complaints, this third complaint was formally received at Police Station Sadar, Ambala and forms part of the official record of the Police Station. The compromise was effected within the Police Station itself after receiving Rs. 20,000/-(Rupees Twenty Thousand).

Xxxxxxx

5. That the following evidence has been collected against the accused-petitioner Preeti so far during investigation:-

i. Electronic Evidence (CDR/Call Detail Records): The Investigating Officer collected the Call Detail Records (CDR) of the accused-(mobile no. 8901990166) as also of co-accused persons and the victim/complainant. Analysis of the CDRs establishes that the accused-petitioner was in active telephonic contact with the co-accused Kuldeep Kaur (Asha Worker, mobile no. 8607931883), co-accused Maan Singh (mobile no. 9991663442) and victim Kuldeep Fauji (mobile no. 9306002138) at the relevant times corresponding to the three incidents of alleged extortion mentioned above. The CDRs thus establish a nexus between the accused-petitioner and other co-accused persons at the material time.

ii. Statement of Co-accused Mann Singh: The disclosure statement of co-accused Maan Singh, recorded during investigation on 02.05.2026 (copy already annexed as Annexure R-1 in the previously filed status report), inter alia discloses and implicates the accused-petitioner Preeti as an active participant in the scheme of filing false

complaints and thereafter extracting money from the victims as a condition for compromise. Maan Singh has stated that he had known the accused-petitioner Preeti for about 2-3 years and that the petitioner was a participant in the activities of the group. Rs.10,000/- have been recovered from his possession pursuant to his disclosure statement.

iii. **Disclosure Statement of Co-accused Anju Bala @Manju:** The disclosure statement of co-accused Anju Bala @ Manju, recorded on 03.05.2026, also establishes her involvement in the criminal conspiracy along with the accused-petitioner. Rs.10,000/- have been recovered from her possession pursuant to her disclosure statement. The co-accused Anju Bala @ Manju has also been sent to judicial custody. Copy of the disclosure statement of co-accused Anju Bala @ Manju is attached herewith as Annexure R-3.

iv. **Compromise Documents:** The Investigating Agency has collected compromise documents/settlement records pertaining to the three incidents referred to in the FIR, which corroborate the act of giving complaints to the police and withdrawing the same after compromise perhaps for consideration.

v. **Statement of Complainant:** The statement of the complainant Gurmeet Singh was recorded, which substantiates the allegations against the accused-petitioner and the other co-accused persons. Copy of statement of complainant recorded u/s 180 BNSS is attached herewith as Annexure R-4.

vi. **Status of Accused Persons:** Out of the total 4 accused persons named in the FIR, co-accused (i)Maan Singh was arrested on 01.05.2026 and (ii)Anju Bala @ Manju has been arrested on 02.05.2026 and are in judicial custody. A total of Rs. 20,000/- (Rs. 10,000/- each) has been recovered from the possession of the said two arrested accused persons. The remaining amount of approximately

Rs.5,30,000/- is yet to be recovered. The accused-petitioner (iii) Preeti & co-accused (iv) Kuldeep Kaur were yet to be arrested in the present case. Petitioner accused Preeti was also served notice under Section 35(3) BNSS to join investigation but she failed to do so and concealed herself at an unknown place, leading her to file the present anticipatory bail petition.”

6. It has also been informed by the Superintendent of Police, District Ambala that departmental proceedings have already been initiated against ASI Babli and in the event of her participation having been established, the said official shall also be nominated as an accused in the present case. State Counsel further submits that the CDRs of ASI Babli specifically reflects that she had been in constant touch with the co-accused and that the filing of complaints only at the Police Stations/Chowkis where the said ASI was posted cannot be brushed aside as a mere co-incidence at this juncture. It is submitted that there is a possibility of various other persons having been fleeced by the petitioners herein by adopting similar mode and methodology. Said persons might not be coming forth to save themselves from disgrace. In order to understand the concrete expanse of the racket being run by the petitioners herein, the custodial interrogation of the petitioners would be required. Learned State Counsel and learned counsel for the complainant contend that the disclosure of the co-accused is only reflective of the participation of the petitioners and collection of evidence would be a process that has to be undertaken during the course of investigation. It would be thus premature at this juncture for the petitioners to contend that there is no evidence collected by the respondent/State as investigation is still undergoing.

7. I have heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective

201 (02 cases) CRM-M-28033-2026(O&M)
CRM-M-31814-2026 (O&M)

parties and have gone through the documents appended alongwith the present petitions as well as noticed the respective arguments made above.

8. Taking into consideration the fact that there are multiple instances of honeytrap recoveries that are alleged in the FIR in question and the fact that prima facie involvement of a police official is also evident, I am of the opinion that it is a part of an organized extortion racket which is being run by the petitioners herein in collusion with other persons. In order to seek indulgence of the Court for pre-arrest bail, the Court is required to be satisfied at this juncture that the process of law has been invoked with clean intent and that there is prima facie case of false implication borne out. The nature of allegations, the manner in which the offence has been committed as well as the level at which the entire racket is being organized, which also involves the stakeholders i.e. the police itself, shows that a fair and complete investigation in the matter would not be possible in case the protective shield of anticipatory bail is extended to the petitioners herein.

9. In view of the above, finding no prima facie merit in the case, the present petitions are dismissed.

10. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

16.06.2026

Sumit Gusain

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No