



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

108

CRM-M-22772-2025
Date of decision: 30.04.2025

Gurwinderpal Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. Lovepreet Handa, Advocate for the petitioner.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.

1. The petitioner in the instant (second) petition is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in case FIR No.181 dated 27.10.2023 under Sections 384, 385, 323, 506, 34 of the IPC, registered at Police Station City Khanna, Police District Khanna, District Ludhiana.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the complainant had, on multiple occasions, received a total sum of Rs.3,65,000/- from the petitioner, which the petitioner had been persistently seeking to recover along with interest. It is further submitted that, on 28.09.2023, the complainant transferred two amounts i.e. Rs.99,000/- and Rs.2 lakhs, to the petitioner through banking transactions. However, despite these payments, the complainant failed to clear the entire outstanding liability.

3. It is further argued that there are no specific or direct allegations against the petitioner concerning the alleged incident of



CRM-M-22772-2025

assault upon the complainant, which has been detailed in the FIR, which has been annexed as Annexure P-1. Learned counsel also contends that, with the intervention of well-wishers, the dispute between the parties has been amicably settled on 21.04.2025 vide Annexure P-4.

4. Notice of motion.

5. On asking of the Court, Mr. H.S. Deol, Sr. DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

6. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has opposed the petition with vehemence, pointing out that the present petition is the second attempt by the petitioner at seeking anticipatory bail, the earlier petition having already been dismissed on merits by a Coordinate Bench of this Court on 15.05.2024. It is further submitted, on instructions, that the petitioner is involved in other criminal cases as well, which militates against the grant of any discretionary relief.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material on record.

8. Although the petitioner seeks to rely upon a purported compromise with the complainant, it is apposite to notice that the complainant has not even been impleaded as a party to the present proceedings, nor is there any indication that the compromise has been verified by a competent forum. Furthermore, this is the second time the petitioner has approached this Court seeking similar relief, and no change in circumstances has been demonstrated to warrant a departure from the reasoning adopted by the Coordinate Bench in its earlier



CRM-M-22772-2025

decision declining relief on merits. In the considered opinion of this Court, the petitioner has, therefore, not been able to make out any fresh or substantial ground that would justify reconsideration of the prayer for anticipatory bail

9. Accordingly, the instant petition is hereby dismissed.

10. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

30.04.2025

Vinay

**(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE**

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