

CRM-M-43577-2020

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

CRM-M-43577-2020

Date of decision: 18.01.2021

Manjit Kaur

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Ms. Shivya Sehgal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Randhir Singh Thind, DAG, Punjab.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

Case is taken up for hearing through video conferencing.

Through this second petition, the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.175 dated 22.09.2020, registered under Sections 406, 498-A, 316, 323, 120-B IPC, at Police Station Division No.1, Police Commissionerate, Jalandhar.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case, and that the nature of injuries on the person of complainant totally falsifies the allegations of the complainant that she had been attacked by six person. Even otherwise, it is contended that the petitioner is now ready to settle the dispute.

On the other hand, learned State counsel while opposing the present petition makes a specific reference to the earlier order dated 15.12.2020, whereby the first petition filed by the petitioner had been dismissed. He further submits that there being no change of circumstance

CRM-M-43577-2020

and no new facts pleaded in the present petition, the same is liable to be dismissed.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

This is the second petition for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, the first having been dismissed vide order dated 15.12.2020 passed by this Court.

While dismissing the earlier bail petition filed by the petitioner, this Court took into consideration the pleas taken by the petitioner. It could not be shown that the pleas raised in the present second petition for bail, were not considered by this Court while dealing with the earlier bail petition. Keeping in view the nature and gravity of the offence, the petitioner cannot be granted the relief as sought in the present petition, only for the purpose of settling the dispute.

In view of the said fact, this Court finds that no indulgence is required to be given to the petitioner and the prayer for bail is liable to be rejected.

Consequently, the present petition is dismissed.

18.01.2021

parveen kumar

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?

Yes/No

Whether reportable?

Yes/No