



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

211

CRM-M No.62883 of 2024  
DATE OF DECISION : 30<sup>th</sup> JANUARY, 2025

Harmanpreet Singh

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

\* \* \* \*

Present : Mr. Robindeep Singh Bhullar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Navdeep Singh, DAG, Punjab with  
SI Puran Singh, PS Nihal Singh Wala.

\* \* \* \*

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (Oral)

The petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the BNSS in case FIR No.68 dated 06.05.2024 under Sections 379, 457 & 427 of the IPC, registered at Police Station Nihal Singh Wala, District Moga.

2. On the previous date of hearing/on 17.12.2024, this court has passed the following order:

*“Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that although the petitioner is named in the FIR in question, however, there is no specific injury attributed and the only allegation levelled against him is of having smashed the windows of the car; a sum of Rs.3000/- along with a mobile handset of the complainant was also alleged to have been stolen by him.*



*On a pointed query posed to the learned counsel as to whether the petitioner has any previous criminal antecedents, he has categorically replied in the negative.”*

3. Thereafter, it was directed that no coercive steps shall be taken against the petitioner.

4. Learned State counsel, on instructions, has confirmed that the petitioner is a man of previous criminal antecedents. It has further been submitted that the petitioner was on bail in a case under the NDPS Act when he yet again committed the crime in question; the petitioner was identified and named by the complainant in the FIR, which left no manner of doubt about his involvement in the present case. It has also been submitted by the learned State counsel that in addition to the present case, there is another case registered under the NDPS Act against the petitioner; he is also facing trial in a case for offence under Section 379 of the IPC/Section 303 of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner has fairly conceded about the previous criminal antecedents of the petitioner, although, on the previous date of hearing he had categorically replied in negative. It has further been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that it was a case of false implication since the other FIR registered for an offence under Section 379 IPC pertained to an occurrence, which allegedly took place just a couple of hours prior to the occurrence in question.

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



7. In view of the previous criminal antecedents of the petitioner and the fact that he was yet again booked in a case of identical nature for which he had already been extended the concession of bail, this court does not deem it fit to extend extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, the present petition stands dismissed.

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.

30<sup>th</sup> January, 2025  
'raj'

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)  
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned:</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable:</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>