

AT JABALPUR

BEFORE

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE

ON THE

MISC. CRIMINAL CASE No.

BETWEEN:-

D/O SHRI
AGED ABOUT , OCCUPATION: BUSINESS R/O
JABALPUR (MADHYA PRADESH) DISTRICT

(BY ADVOCATE)

.....APPLICANT

AND

1. THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH THROUGH
POLICE STATION OMTI DISTRICT JABALPUR
(MADHYA PRADESH)

2. S/O AGED
ABOUT 30 YEARS, R/O ROAD
JABALPUR (MADHYA PRADESH)

.....RESPONDENTS

(BY SHRI - GOVERNMENT ADVOCATE)
(- SENIOR ADVOCATE WITH SHRI
ADVOCATE.)

This application coming on for admission this day, the court passed the following:

ORDER

This first application under Section 438 of Cr.P.C. has been filed for grant of anticipatory bail.

The applicant is apprehending of her arrest in connection with Crime No.

registered at Police Station Jabalpur (M.P.) for offence

It is submitted by the Counsel for the applicant the applicant is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the present case. It is also submitted that allegation of demand of an amount Rs.15,00,000/- is false. In fact the applicant herself has made a complaint against the complainant on _____ that the complainant has committed an offence under Section 376(2)(n), 377 and 506 of IPC on which the present FIR has been registered. It is also submitted that no offence has been committed by the applicant and the entire set of allegations against the applicant is false and baseless. On the aforesaid ground, learned counsel for applicant prays for grant of bail.

Per contra, learned counsel for State as well as learned senior counsel for objector opposed the application vehemently. It is submitted by them that the applicant is running a gang of honey trap. Various FIRs™ have been lodged by her in different police stations against different persons and she is in a habit of blackmailing the persons and she also recovers huge amount from them. It is submitted that in Police Station _____ Police Station- _____, Jabalpur, Police Station _____ District Kanpur, Almost 6 FIR were registered against the present applicant for the same offence.

Considering the contention of learned counsel for both the parties, facts and circumstances of the case, objections raised by the counsel for the complainant coupled with the antecedents of the applicant, this Court is of the considered opinion that it is not a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail to the applicant.

Accordingly, the application fails and is hereby dismissed.