



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

208-2

CRM-M-30282-2024

Date of decision: 08.08.2024

Abhishek

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. Mohan Singh Chauhan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Trishanjali Sharma, DAG, Haryana.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail under Section 438 of the Cr.P.C. in case FIR No.408 dated 25.07.2023 under Sections 341, 506, 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959 registered at Police Station Ambala Cantt, District Ambala.

2. Learned State counsel on instructions at the outset has prayed for dismissal of the instant petition as the petitioner has not complied with order dated 20.06.2024 which had been passed by a Coordinate Bench of this Court in the following terms:-

“Inter alia, it has been contended by counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He submits that the role attributed to the petitioner is regarding threatening the complainant which is not substantiated. He further submits that the similarly situated co-accused has already been granted interim bail by this Court vide order dated 07.05.2024 passed in CRM-M-5902 of 2024.”

**CRM-M-30282-2024**

3. Learned State counsel has also brought to the notice of this Court that the petitioner is involved in eight other criminal cases, including cases under the Arms Act. She submits that it is, thus, evident that the petitioner is a habitual offender and has been repeatedly committing serious offences and also misusing the concession of bail which was granted to him in the other criminal cases pending against him.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in the wake of the petitioner not complying with order dated 20.06.2024, this Court may pass any appropriate order.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material on record.

6. Prima facie, the petitioner comes across as being a habitual offender as he is involved in eight other criminal cases, including cases under the Arms Act. In the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, this Court does not deem it fit to extend the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the instant petition is hereby dismissed.

7. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

08.08.2024

Vinay

**(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE**

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