

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

CRM-M-20327-2019

DATE OF DECISION:-21.05.2019

NAGINA BEGUM

...PETITIONER...

V.

STATE OF PUNJAB

...RESPONDENT...

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMENDRA JAIN

Present: Mr. Ranjan Lakhanpal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Shubhashish Kukreti, Advocate,
for the complainant.

RAMENDRA JAIN, J. (ORAL)

Prayer in this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. has been made for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, in case, FIR No.0060 dated 24.03.2019, registered under Sections 457, 380, 448, 427, 511 and 149 IPC, Police Station Civil Lines, Bathinda.

According to the prosecution, in the night of 24.03.2013, the petitioner, after obtaining interim bail in case FIR No.47 dated 12.03.2019, registered under Sections 384, 447, 506, 149 and 511 IPC, Police Station Civil Lines, Bathinda, demolished the boundary wall of the complainant land, dismantle the gate of his plot and committed theft of his welding set.

Learned counsel contends that the only allegation against the petitioner is that in the day time at 2:00 p.m., she, while sitting in front of the plot of the complainant, was abusing and did rekie. She did not committed any act of vandalism, demolished the boundary wall and dismantled the gate of the plot. In fact, these allegations are against her co-accused. She has falsely been implicated. No recovery has to be effected from the petitioner.

On the other hand, learned counsel for the complainant refuting the above contentions of learned counsel for the petitioner contends that petitioner has been booked in six more FIRs of similar nature. The petitioner is a habitual offender. After granting interim bail in FIR No. 47 dated 12.03.2019, the petitioner committed the present offence. She has no regard for the law.

Considering the seriousness of allegations against the petitioner and that after grant of interim bail, she committed the present offence and further that the petitioner has been booked in six more FIRs of similar offence, this Court is of the considered view that the petitioner is a habitual offender and such type of offenders does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

Dismissed.

21.05.2019

sonika

(RAMENDRA JAIN)
JUDGE

whether speaking/reasoned:
whether reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No