

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

CRM-M-31164-2021 (O&M)

Date of decision: 11.10.2021

Manisha Sharma

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Vijay Lath, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Pardeep Prakash Chahar, DAG Haryana.

Mr. Nagar Singh, Advocate for the complainant.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

This is the second petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 940 dated 15.09.2018 under Sections 120-B, 419, 420, 467, 468 and 471 IPC registered at Police Station Faridabad Central, District Faridabad.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case and seeks parity with co-accused Sachin. The petitioner is having a younger daughter and she has to look after her, in case she is taken into the custody, her daughter will also have to suffer.

In support of his case, learned counsel for the petitioner relies upon the judgment passed in Siddharth Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh and another, 2021(9) Scale 598.

Learned State counsel assisted by the learned counsel for the complainant, submits that the earlier bail petition of the petitioner was dismissed on merits by this Court vide order dated 07.07.2021 and the same was assailed before Hon'ble the Supreme Court by way of filing of SLP and the same was also dismissed and there is no fresh ground, therefore, the present petition is also liable to be dismissed.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

There is no change of circumstances than the one, mentioned in the earlier petition. Still further no new facts have been pleaded. As referred to above, the position remains the same as was noticed in the order dated 07.07.2021.

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

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

11.10.2021

Mangal Singh

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No