

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

224

CRM-M-28640-2021 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 08.12.2022

SATVIR SINGH

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. AS Jattana, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Gurlal Singh Dhillon, AAG Punjab.

Mr. Ravinder Singh, Advocate for respondent No.4.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J.(Oral)

Through this petition, the petitioner-complainant seeks cancellation of regular bail granted to respondent No.4/accused by this Court, vide order dated 24.11.2020 in FIR No.345 dated 05.09.2020, registered under Section 306 IPC, at Police Station Zirakpur, District SAS Nagar (Mohali).

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that after grant of regular bail to respondent No.4, he had tried to grab the property of the petitioner and accordingly, FIR No.340 dated 06.06.2021, under Sections 379, 447, 511 and 506 IPC, at Police Station Zirakpur, District SAS Nagar, has been registered against him and thus, the petitioner has misused the concession of bail granted to him.

On the other hand, while opposing the prayer made in this petition, learned counsel for respondent No.4 submits that the petitioner herein has no locus standi to file the present petition; that the petitioner and respondent No.4 are the co-owners in the property and that in FIR

No.340, the petitioner was granted ad-interim anticipatory bail by a Coordinate Bench of this Court on 30.06.2021, which was later on made absolute. He further submits that mere registration of another FIR does not amount to cancellation of the regular bail granted to the petitioner way back on 24.11.2020, specially when the complainant in the said FIR is the petitioner herein. Still further, it is submitted that son of respondent No.4 has moved a complaint to the Senior Superintendent of Police and the Station House Officer concerned, regarding the threats being given by the petitioner to him and his family members and that too on the asking of one Bhupi Rana, who is confined in jail.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

As noticed above, the petitioner and respondent No.4 are the co-owners in the property. This Court, after hearing both the learned counsel for the parties, have granted regular bail to respondent No.4 on 24.11.2020. Learned counsel for the petitioner is unable to point out as to in what manner, respondent No.4 has misused the concession of bail granted to him. Mere registration of an FIR does not give a handle to the petitioner to seek cancellation of the earlier bail order. Above all, respondent No.4 is on bail in another FIR, which was lodged by the petitioner himself.

In view of the above, no ground is made out to cancel the concession of regular bail granted to respondent No.4.

Dismissed.

08.12.2022

Aman Jain

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

: *Yes/No*
: *Yes/No*