

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-11440-2024
DECIDED ON: 04.03.2024

BAHADAR SINGH
.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB
.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Gurpyar Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

1. The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Section 438 Cr.P.C., seeking anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.0082, dated 23.12.2023, under Section 406 of IPC, 1860, registered at Police Station Rureke Kalan, District Barnala, Punjab.
2. Before learned counsel for the petitioner could submit, Mr. Rajiv Verma, DAG Punjab on instructions from HC Gursewak Singh submits that vide report dated 11.07.2023, Sections 465, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of IPC were added.
3. The petitioner is guilty of suppressing these material facts in the instant petition, as the same are neither mentioned in the pleadings nor in the prayer clause, despite having full knowledge about the same.
4. When countered by this Court, Mr. Gurpyar Singh, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he had filed a petition under Section 406 of IPC before the trial Court and it is only under that provision, the bail has been declined and, therefore, he has rightly preferred the instant petition before this Court seeking anticipatory bail.

5. Be that as it may, this Court simpliciter on the ground that the petitioner has full knowledge about the offences, which were added later on, as has been enumerated hereinabove, there is a material concealment on the part of the petitioner in the instant petition, who has not approached this Court with clean hands. Hence, the instant petition is dismissed with Rs.25,000/- as costs to be deposited with the Punjab and Haryana High Court Bar Association, Chandigarh (Account No.65035682434, IFSC Code SBIN0050306, State Bank of India, Sector-1, Chandigarh).

04.03.2024

Meenu

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No