

# Purushottam Meena vs The State Of Madhya Pradesh on 7 July, 2021

**Author: Virender Singh**

**Bench: Virender Singh**

1

MCRC-33145-2021

THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH  
MCRC-33145-2021  
(Purushottam Meena vs The State of Madhya Pradesh)

Jabalpur, Dated 07-07-2021.

Heard through Video Conferencing.

Shri Ankit Saxena, learned counsel for the petitioner.  
Shri Gopal Jaiswal, Panel Lawyer for the respondent /State.

ORDER

Crime No. Under section Police Station Arrest Date 152/2021 384-C of the Crime Branch 15.06.2021 I.P.C and 67, Bhopal, 67-A, 66-E of District Bhopal the IT Act. (M.P.) As declared by the petitioner, this is the first bail application under Section 439 of Cr.P.C..

2. The prosecution case, in brief, is that a group of perpetrators had planned to extort money from their victims. One of them, Monika Sharma's job was that she used to call the victims, be friend them by talking sweetly, then instigate them to make video call in nude state, record those calls and thereafter they all used to force them to transfer money in their accounts under the threat to make those videos viral. In this case also, Ms.Monika Sharma first sent a friend request on the Facebook account of the complainant and developed friendship with him. She asked him to give his whatsapp number and started chatting and making video calls. During this period, sometimes she recorded his nude videos and asked him to pay money threatening that otherwise she will upload the videos on the YouTube and forward them to his relatives. Under the fear of character assassination, the complainant transferred Rs.2,500/- first and Rs.2,600/- on the second occasion.

2 MCRC-33145-2021 But by the passage of time, they increased their demands by asking more and more money. Perturbed with their demand, the petitioner approached the police and lodged the FIR.

3. In the investigation, it was found that the money transferred by the complainant was received in the account of the petitioner, who further transferred it to the account of the co-accused Yaduram Meena. Yaduram Meena admitted before the police that he used to developed friendship on the Facebook and then instigate them to give their nude poses. He also used to record their nude poses

and thereafter extort money under the threat of circulating them on the social media.

4. It is submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is totally innocent, his fault is only that he was room mate of co-accused Yaduram Meena when he was preparing for the competitive exams. Once Yaduram Meena requested him that his account is not properly working. He is in need of some money and has requested his family to send it but they are unable to send it as his account is not properly working. He requested him to receive money in his account and give it to him. Relying on his statement, the petitioner agreed to and received money and handed it over to him on the same day. He was not aware about any misdeed of the co-accused persons. He acted simply on the request of his room mate. He never received any share in the booty and the alleged money transaction has been done only once through his account. Keeping him in jail will badly affect his career. He is a meritorious student. His chances to get selected in the competitive exams will diminish if he is kept behind the bars for a long period. He is ready to co-operate with the investigation and is ready to face the trial which is likely to take time. He is permanent resident of village Dhankheda Jaatpur, District Alwar, Rajasthan. There is 3 MCRC-33145-2021 no possibility of his absconding. He is ready to furnish adequate surety as may be ordered by this Court and to abide all the conditions which may be imposed by this Court. Therefore, he may be granted bail.

5. So far as allegations mentioned supra are concerned, the learned Panel Lawyer has not controverted the facts narrated by learned counsel for the petitioner. His objection is that the petitioner was involved in the crime cautiously. He along with the other co-accused persons used to extort money in the manner and method narrated supra. The petitioner is resident of Rajesthan. Possibility of his absconding cannot be ruled out and it will hamper the trial therefore, it is requested that the petitioner be not granted bail.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record.

7. Learned Panel Lawyer could not mention any other incident except the alleged one wherein, the money has been received in the account of the petitioner or that out of the money received, any share was kept by him.

8. Having regard to the allegation that the petitioner permitted his roommate to use his account only once, the nature and gravity of the allegations made against him and the other facts and circumstances of the case, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on bail. Therefore, without commenting on the merits of the case, the petition is allowed.

9. It is directed that petitioner Purushottam Meena be released from custody on his furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs.50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand) with two solvent sureties Rs.25,000/-(Rupees Twenty Five Thousand) each out of which one should be local solvent surety to the satisfaction of the 4 MCRC-33145-2021 Trial Court for his appearance before the Trial Court as and when required further subject to the following conditions :-

- (i) The petitioner shall co-operate with the trial and shall not seek unnecessary adjournments on frivolous grounds to protract the trial.;

(ii) The petitioner shall not directly or indirectly allure or make any inducement, threat or promise to the prosecution witnesses, so as to dissuade him from disclosing truth before the Court;

(iii) The petitioner shall not commit any offence or involve in any criminal activity;

(iv) In case of his involvement in any other criminal activity or breach of any other aforesaid conditions, the bail granted in this case may also be cancelled.

(VIRENDER SINGH) JUDGE Sha