

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

**CRM NO. M-34494 OF 2015 (O&M)
DECIDED ON : 18.11.2015**

Het Ram

...Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M. M. S. BEDI

Present : Mr. Baldev Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

M. M. S. BEDI, J. (ORAL)

When questioned as to what are the changed circumstances for enabling this Court to entertain third petition for pre-arrest bail, counsel for the petitioner submits that Annexure P-10 (copy of the statement of Notary Public) which was not earlier available to the petitioner, has come to the knowledge of the petitioner after dismissal of the first and second petitions for pre-arrest bail.

Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that on the basis of that document, the petitioner is able to contend that agreement relied upon by the complainant is a forged document.

I have heard counsel for the petitioner and gone through the earlier orders passed by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court, wherein in order dated 12.03.2015, it has been specifically observed that the contention with regard to agreement as a forged document has been raised earlier also (in the first petition).

Since the same contention is being raised in the third petition, there is no new circumstance in the instant petition and the same is dismissed.

(M. M. S. BEDI)
JUDGE

NOVEMBER 18, 2015
shalini