



212.

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

**CRM-M-61779-2024**

Date of decision: 18.03.2025

Ravinder 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. 10.12.2024, 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 it is on account of history of strained relations between the parties that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case. While drawing the attention of this Court to the allegations levelled



in the FIR in question annexed as Annexure P-1, it has been submitted that no doubt the petitioner has indeed been named therein, however, no injury has been attributed to the petitioner and the only allegation, if any, is of being armed with a kirch and thereafter attempting to injure the complainant with the same.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of order dated 10.12.2024, the petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of complainant has submitted that the petitioner has misused the concession of interim bail, as it is a matter of record that another FIR for offences under Section 307 of IPC and Arms Act, have been registered against the petitioner wherein yet again, the petitioner had attacked the complainant party. In support, learned counsel has produced photocopy of the FIR in question, which is taken on record.

5. 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 not disputed the submissions made by counsel for the complainant. Rather, learned State counsel has submitted that the petitioner is a habitual offender, as this is not the first time that he has been involved in a criminal case. Previously, criminal case under Section 295-A of IPC was registered against him at Police Station Mattewal, Amritsar Rural, bearing FIR No.25, dated 28.04.2015, and yet again, FIR No.4, dated 08.01.2025, under Sections 115(2), 109, 298 of BNS read with



Sections 25, 27 of Arms Act, Police Station Kathunangal, Amritsar Rural, has been registered against him during the pendency of the instant petition.

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

7. 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.

8. Present petition stands dismissed accordingly.

9. 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