

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

.....

Criminal Misc. No.M-306 of 2015

.....

Date of decision:2.2.2015

Manjinderjit Bawa

...Petitioner

v.

State of Punjab

Respondent

....

Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Inderjit Singh

.....

Present: Mr. R.D. Bawa, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. S.S. Chandumajra, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab for
the respondent-State.

Mr. Parambir Singh, Advocate for the complainant.

.....

Inderjit Singh, J.

The petitioner has filed this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.108 dated 24.9.2014 registered for the offences under Sections 406 and 498-A IPC at Police Station Women Cell Ludhiana, District Ludhiana.

Notice of motion has been issued in this case.

Mr. S.S. Chandumajra, learned Deputy Advocate General, Punjab has put in appearance on behalf of the respondent-State and Mr. Parambir Singh, learned Advocate has appeared for the complainant and contested this petition.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned Deputy Advocate General, Punjab appearing for the respondent-State and learned counsel for the complainant and have gone through the record.

The first bail petition for grant of anticipatory bail has already been decided by this Court as per order dated 16.12.2014 (Annexure-P.9). A perusal of the earlier order shows that the main allegations are against the present petitioner and he is required for custodial interrogation and it was held that no case was made out to grant anticipatory bail to the present petitioner.

Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that now there is changed circumstances as he could not produce some documents earlier to bring it to the knowledge of the Court that it was a simple dowryless marriage and there was agreement dated 13.3.2014 duly signed by the complainant herself and her father Jagjit Singh etc. This is no ground if any document has not been produced by the learned counsel for the petitioner at the time of deciding the first bail petition. The petitioner has no right to file anticipatory bail petition time and again by stating that in the earlier bail petition, he could not produce one document or the other. There is nothing on the record to show that as to how the petitioner is not required for custodial interrogation. The earlier bail petition has been dismissed by holding that the petitioner is required for custodial interrogation as he is the main accused and main allegations are against him.

[3]

Therefore, from the above, I do not find any ground to grant the anticipatory bail. Hence, finding no merit in this petition, the same is dismissed.

February 2, 2015.

(Inderjit Singh)
Judge

hsp