



213.

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

CRM-M-63206-2024

Date of decision: 18.03.2025

Kulwinder Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Balbir Singh Jaswal, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Rana, Senior DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Ritesh Pandey, Advocate, for the complainant.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail under Section 482 of BNSS, in case FIR No.112, dated 29.10.2024, under Sections 109, 118(2), 115(2), 191(3), 190 of BNS, registered at Police Station Kathu Nangal, District Amritsar.

2. On the last date of hearing i.e. 17.12.2024, while noticing the following submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, this Court had granted the concession of interim bail to the petitioner and asked him to join investigation:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, contends that the petitioner although named in the FIR but has been attributed a simple injury with a dattar on the left wrist of the injured-complainant. It has also been submitted that injury which was opined to be dangerous to life has not been attributed to the petitioner but to co-accused Lovepreet Singh.”



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of order dated 17.12.2024, the petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.

4. Learned State counsel has filed short reply by way of an affidavit dated 17.03.2025 of Jaspal Singh, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub-Division, Majitha, Amritsar (Rural) on behalf of respondent-State, in Court today, which is taken on record. Learned State counsel has submitted that the petitioner has not approached this Court with clean hands. The petitioner is a habitual offender, which is evident from the fact that there are two other criminal cases registered against him. In support, learned State counsel has drawn the attention of this Court to paragraph 9 of the short reply, which has been filed in Court today.

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

6. In the circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, prima facie, the petitioner does indeed come across as a habitual offender and hence, he does not deserve the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail.

7. Present petition stands dismissed accordingly.

8. 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.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

March 18, 2025

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