

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

CRM-M-43456-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 03-09-2025

Simran Singh Bedi

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Saurav Bhatia, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Ms. Pooja Nayar Sharma, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Ferry Sofat, Advocate
for the complainant.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J. (Oral)

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
1	5.1.2024	NRI, SAS Nagar, Mohali	420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 448, 120B IPC

1. This is second petition filed by the petitioner under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, [BNSS], on the basis of compromise, seeking anticipatory bail in the FIR captioned above.

2. Per paragraph 21 of the bail application, the accused has the following criminal antecedents:

FIR No.	Date	Offenses	Police Station
501	18.9.2021	409, 465, 466, 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC and 82 Registration Act, 1908 and Section 420 IPC (added later on)	Baltana, Zirakpur, District SAS Nagar, Mohali

3. The facts and allegations are being taken from the order dated 11.1.2024 passed by the trial Court in the application seeking anticipatory bail, which reads as follows:

“The facts of the case in nut-shell are that complainant Assa Singh Sandhu is NRI and is residing in USA. He came to India on 10.01.2020. He wanted to sell his property at Bathinda. His nephew Bhupinder Singh took him in his house at Mohali. He sold his property for Rs. 2.5 crores. The complainant had Rs. 1.57 crores in the form of FDR and he wanted to send this amount to his son at America, but due to dishonestly Bhupinder Singh got purchased house No.1978, Phase-10. Mohali in his name. He further alleged that he illegally confined ham in his house He provided his e-mail and mobile number in the bank account of complainant. He used to take cheques from him under threats and made

withdrawals of cash amounts. It was further alleged that a forged rent note was prepared in the name of Simran Singh Bedi and possession of house was delivered to him. His cash, gold and identity proofs were also taken by Bhupinder Singh.”

4. The petitioner's counsel contends that pre-trial incarceration would cause an irreversible injustice to the petitioner and their family. He further submits that a compromise (Annexure P-4) has been effected between the parties and accordingly, a petition seeking quashing of FIR in question shall be filed soon. He also submits that the petitioner would have no objection whatsoever to any stringent conditions that this Court may impose, including that if the petitioner repeats the offense or commits any non-bailable offense, the State may file an application to revoke this bail before the concerned Special Judge or Sessions Court having jurisdiction over this FIR, which shall have the authority to cancel this bail, and may do so at their discretion, to which the petitioner shall have no objection.

5. The State's counsel opposes bail.

REASONING:

6. Counsel for the complainant submits that the matter stands compromised between the parties and they have no objection if this Court grants bail to the petitioner.

7. Earlier also, the petitioner had filed anticipatory bail application before this Court, which was dismissed by a coordinate Bench vide order dated 30.07.2024 passed in CRM-M-4803-2024, against which the petitioner had even approached the Hon'ble Supreme Court, which dismissed the bail petition by passing the following order:-

- “1. Heard Mr. Shree Prakash Sinha, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner.
2. The counsel refers to the FIR and also the civil proceedings to say that anticipatory bail should be considered for the petitioner.
3. We have considered the reasoning given by the High Court in paragraph 6 of the impugned order to reject anticipatory bail. The petitioner is a property dealer and has similar criminal antecedents of cheating people of their valuable property. The victim in this case is an 81 year old residing in USA and his property at Mohali is the subject matter of the FIR.
4. Here we are of the considered opinion that anticipatory bail is unmerited in the present matter. The Special Leave Petition is accordingly dismissed.
5. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand closed.”

8. Despite rejection of the bail by Hon'ble the Supreme Court, the petitioner has come up before this Court seeking anticipatory bail, although the petitioner was well aware of the fact that this Court is not competent to grant bail once the Supreme Court has dismissed his bail petition. Accordingly, no case for bail is made out and the present petition is dismissed. Moreover, in case there is any change of circumstance after dismissal of bail by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the remedy for grant of bail does not lie before this Court, because of dismissal of bail, on merits, by the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

9. **Petition dismissed.** All pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

03-09-2025
AK

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

NOTE: Whether speaking/non-speaking: Speaking
Whether reportable: YES/NO