

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

102

CRM-M-38848-2021

Date of Decision: 20.09.2021

Amanpreet Singh @ Mampy

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. Amit Arora, Advocate, for the petitioner.

(proceedings conducted through video conferencing)

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has approached this Court seeking grant of anticipatory bail in respect of a case registered against him vide FIR No.144 dated 23.12.2017 at Police Station Harike, District Tarn Taran, under Sections 17A/27/28/29/30/31/50/51 of the Wild Life (Protection) Act (offences under Sections 447/427/506/186/148/149 IPC added later on).
2. As per the case of the prosecution, Gurmit Singh, Forest Guard, received information from Bakshish Singh, Beldar and Amrik Singh, labourer, to the effect that Amanpreet Singh, Pargat Singh @ Pappu, Manjit Singh @ Kakku, Sukha Singh and two more unidentified persons had illegally occupied government land, which falls under the Wildlife Sanctuary, Harike. The said persons had destroyed 6-7 acres of land, which is for the habitat of wild animals. It is further alleged that the said persons repeatedly used

to illegally occupy the land of sanctuary. A similar information had been received earlier also regarding which Gurmit Singh, Forest Guard, had sent report on 19.12.2017. The officials of the Forest Department had come across the said persons in the sanctuary and the said persons, who were armed with weapons, threatened the employees and also obstructed them from discharging their official duties. It is also alleged that complaints against Amanpreet Singh had been filed earlier also i.e. complaint bearing report No.345606 dated 22.11.2010 and complaint No.345612 dated 22.11.2013 regarding illegal possession in which he had been declared proclaimed offender.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that he has falsely been implicated in the instant case and that in fact the offences in question i.e. offences under the Wild Life (Protection) Act, are bailable offences and all the co-accused have already been granted bail and in these circumstances, the petitioner also deserves the same concession on the grounds of parity.
4. I have considered the aforesaid submissions addressed before this Court.
5. The petitioner had initially approached the Court of Sessions at Tarn Taran seeking grant of anticipatory bail, wherein vide order dated 15.10.2018 he had been granted interim bail. However, since the petitioner did not join investigation despite having availed several opportunities, the trial Court dismissed the petition vide

order dated 15.11.2018. The instant petition has now been filed after about 3 years without there being any explanation as to why no such petition was filed earlier.

6. Having regard to the conduct of the petitioner, wherein he despite having been granted interim bail in the year 2018 did not choose to join investigation and is also stated to be involved earlier in identical cases, wherein in fact it is alleged that he had been declared a proclaimed offender, this Court does not find any special case for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. The petition is sans merit and is hereby dismissed.

20.09.2021

Vimal

**(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)
JUDGE**Whether speaking/reasoned: **Yes/No**Whether reportable: **Yes/No**