

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

CRM No.M-29773 of 2017 (O&M)

Date of Decision: August 17, 2017

Amandeep Singh

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr.Naresh Kaushik, Advocate
for the petitioner.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

Petitioner has filed this second petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.128 dated 19.05.2017 under Sections 498-A and 406 IPC, registered at Police Station Sultanpur Lodhi, District Kapurthala.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and have gone through the record.

From the record, I find that this is second bail petition. The earlier anticipatory bail petition filed by the petitioner was dismissed by this Court on 27.07.2017. When the petitioner filed anticipatory bail before the Court of Session, at the same time, he also filed petition for anticipatory bail before this Court. Keeping in view the conduct of the petitioner, his earlier bail petition was dismissed as he filed the petition for same relief before two

I have gone through the order passed by learned Addl. Sessions Judge-I, Kapurthala. Learned Addl. Sessions Judge also dismissed the anticipatory bail application by stating that the petitioner moved that application by stating it as second. The Court below held that another application has already been filed before the High Court, therefore, the application in question becomes third bail application. It is also written in the order dated 03.08.2017 that even in the affidavit, it has been mentioned as second bail application. The Court below held that the fact pleaded in the present application, is misleading, as such the petitioner is entitled for discretionary relief.

From the record, I find that due to the conduct of the petitioner, he is not entitled to benefit of anticipatory bail. Otherwise also, as per prosecution version, present petitioner is husband of the complainant and the main allegations are against him and dowry articles etc. are to be recovered from him.

Keeping in view the above facts and circumstances of the present case, I do not find it a fit case where petitioner is entitled to benefit of anticipatory bail.

Therefore, finding no merit in the present petition, the same is dismissed.

August 17, 2017
Vgulati

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes
No