

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

CRM-M-19729 of 2015.

Date of Decision: 15.06.2015

Samarjeet Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMENDRA JAIN

Present: Mr. Neeraj Gaur, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ramendra Jain, J.

This is 4th application for anticipatory bail moved by the petitioner Samarjeet Singh in case FIR No.53 dated 21.04.2008 under Sections 420/467/468/471/120-B IPC registered at police station Farrukh Nagar, Gurgaon.

It may be relevant to mention here that on earlier three occasions, bail applications moved on similar grounds have already been dismissed.

Brief facts of the case are that the petitioner in conspiracy with his accomplices had prepared a false and fabricated resolution in the name of Ex-Directors of the Company. Manjeet Singh had executed a false and fabricated sale deed dated 04.03.2008 in favour of D.P. Singh and Rishi qua land

District Gurgaon owned by M/s Ajantas Shilpalaya Pvt. Ltd.

Concededly, the petitioner approached the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India by way of SLP (Crl.) No.42 of 2011. The aforesaid petition was dismissed as withdrawn with liberty to the petitioner to renew the application before the Additional Sessions Judge, which shall decide the matter on merits.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is an innocent person, inasmuch as he is not the beneficiary of the sale deed. A false case has been foisted upon the petitioner. No custodial interrogation is required as the main accused has already been arrested.

I have given my thoughtful consideration to the arguments advanced by the learned counsel for the petitioner.

It is evident that the arguments raised now before this Court have already been advanced on earlier three occasions which were found substanceless and meritless, resulted into dismissal of all his three bail applications. Now, the petitioner under the garb of fourth bail application wishes to project new case, without bringing any fresh material, which is not even maintainable. It is a sheer wastage of precious time, particularly, when his all arguments have been negated. Approaching time and again, with the similar pleas, does not give a right to the petitioner to claim the concession of anticipatory bail, in any manner, particularly, when on three occasions, his bail applications were found substanceless by this Court. It is settled proposition of law that second anticipatory bail application is not

maintainable, in the absence of any fresh material.

In view of this, the present petition being bereft of any merits, is hereby dismissed.

15.06.2015
'yogesh/kd'

(RAMENDRA JAIN)
JUDGE