

102

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

CRM-M-33786-2017

Date of decision-14.09.2017

Munish Sood

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. Inder Pal Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J. (Oral)

By filing the present petition under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the petitioner has sought anticipatory bail in FIR No.135 dated 26.09.2013 registered under Sections 420 and 120-B of Indian Penal Code at Police Station Division No.2, Ludhiana City, District Ludhiana.

Learned counsel contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further contends that the petitioner has no concern with the complainant's firm as the material which was sent by the complainant's firm to the petitioner's firm was returned back to the complainant's firm.

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

This is second bail petition. The first petition for grant of anticipatory bail was dismissed as withdrawn, vide order dated 06.07.2017

without the leave of the Court to file a fresh one. Instead of submitting to the process of justice, the petitioner chose to file the second petition for grant of bail under Section 438 of Cr.P.C without there being change of circumstances during the interregnum period in favour of the petitioner. Therefore, this Court is not inclined to go into the merits of the case.

Consequently, bail application stands dismissed.

Anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

September 14, 2017

vanita

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No