

# Mamta Panwar vs The State Of Madhya Pradesh on 18 December, 2024

**Author: Prakash Chandra Gupta**

**Bench: Prakash Chandra Gupta**

NEUTRAL CITATION NO. 2024:MPHC-IND:36312

1  
IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH  
AT INDORE  
BEFORE  
HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE PRAKASH CHANDRA GUPTA  
ON THE 18<sup>th</sup> OF DECEMBER, 2024  
MISC. CRIMINAL CASE No. 40319 of 2024  
MAMTA PANWAR  
Versus  
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH

Appearance:  
Shri Gaurav Rawat, learned counsel for the applicant.  
Ms. Neelu Khetra, learned Dy.Govt.Advocate for the res  
Shri Avinash Sirpurkar, learned senior counsel with Sh  
learned counsel for the complainant.

ORDER

Heard with the aid of case diary.

This is first application filed under Section 439 of Cr.P.C. for grant of bail to the applicant, in connection with FIR/Crime No.212/2024, Date:- (Not mentioned) registered at P.S.-Palasia, District-Indore (M.P.) for commission of offence punishable under Sections 384, 389, 182, 195, 120-B of the IPC.

2. Prosecution story in brief is that on 13/06/2024 the prosecutrix/ co-

accused had lodged an FIR bearing crime no. 210/ 2024 offence punishable u/S 328, 376 and 506 of IPC at P/S Palasia, Indore Urban against Sajal Mittal. During investigation of the aforementioned crime, father of Sajal Mittal namely; Satish Mittal filed an application on 14/06/2024 stating that the prosecutrix/ co-accused has lodged a false report against his son Sajal, wherein Sajal has been arrested. After lodging of the aforesaid FIR, the prosecutrix alongwith her husband and other family members had sent message that they will get Sajal released in return NEUTRAL CITATION NO. 2024:MPHC-IND:36312 2 MCRC-40319-2024 of money. On 14/06/2024 when the complainant went to police station to meet Sajal, the prosecutrix and her husband met him. Both of them told the

complainant that he met with them at Palasia Square. Thereafter he met the complainant and her husband then they demanded Rs.50,00,000/- to get Sajal released. Complainant expressed inability to pay the sum of money. Thereafter, the complainant met Sajal in the court premises then he told him that the prosecutrix is blackmailing him, he has not committed the offence and he has been falsely implicated. Complainant also came to know that the prosecutrix being a lady runs a racket of blackmailing and by this she has gotten several persons into honey trap and has blackmailed all of them. She has had done 7 - 8 marriages, wherein after the marriage she used to flee away from there after taking gifts because of which she is also known as 'Luteri Dulhan'. On the basis of aforesaid written complaint an FIR was lodged on 15/06/2024 against the applicant and co-accused persons Neeraj, Shubhan, Rishi Choudhary, Radhey Pahalwan, Madan and prosecutrix. On completion of investigation of crime no. 210/ 2024 it was found that the prosecutrix had lodged false FIR against Neeraj and she has attempted extortion against him.

3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that, the applicant has not committed the offence and has falsely been implicated in the case. It is submitted that applicant is a lady and she is in custody since 16.6.2024. The offence is triable by Judicial Magistrate First Class. After completion of investigation charge-sheet has been filed. Trial will take considerable long time for its disposal, therefore, it is prayed that the applicant be released on bail.

4. On other hand learned counsel for the state/ non-applicant as well as learned counsel for the complainant have opposed the prayer and submit that NEUTRAL CITATION NO. 2024:MPHC-IND:36312 3 MCRC-40319-2024 applicant has one criminal antecedent, therefore, she is not entitled for bail.

5. Having considered the rival contentions of the learned counsel for the parties, perused the case diary, also looking to the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case and allegations made against the applicant, this Court is of considered view that this is a fit case to grant bail to the applicant. Hence, without expressing any opinion on merit of the case, this application is allowed.

6. It is directed that the applicant- Mamta Panwar be released on bail upon her furnishing personal bond in the sum of Rs.50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand only) with solvent surety in the like amount to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court for her appearance before the trial Court on all such dates as may be fixed in this behalf by the trial Court during pendency of the trial. It is further directed that applicant shall comply with the provisions of Section 437(3) of Criminal Procedure Code, 1973. In case the applicant is found in similar nature of activities in future, the complainant is free to approach this Court for cancellation of bail.

7. M.Cr.C. stands disposed off, accordingly.

C.c. as per rules.

(PRAKASH CHANDRA GUPTA) JUDGE patil