



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.45236 of 2024
Date of decision: 26th September, 2024

Punit Singh
... Petitioner
Versus
State of Haryana
... Respondent

CORAM: HON’BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Shail Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.
Ms. Trishanjali Sharma, Dy. Advocate General, Haryana
for the respondent/State.
Mr. Sant Lal Barwala, Advocate for the complainant.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.

1. This is the second petition filed by the petitioner seeking the concession of anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the BNSS in case FIR No.180 dated 27.03.2024 under Sections 147, 149, 323, 325, 341, 379-B, 427, 506 of the IPC (Sections 325, 379-B IPC added later on) registered at Police Station HTM, Hisar, District Hisar.
2. On the last date of hearing, it had been argued by the learned counsel for the petitioner that his role was at par with that of co-accused, who had since been extended the concession of bail.
3. On being put to notice, learned State counsel, assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, have vehemently disputed the submissions made by the counsel opposite and have submitted that the petitioner cannot claim parity with the co-accused Gaurav, who had

been only attributed slaps on the friend of the complainant, whereas the present petitioner is visible in the CCTV footage while attacking the complainant with bricks along with the other co-accused; beating and inflicting injuries on the person of the complainant as well as his friend. Furthermore, it has been submitted that the petitioner had filed a petition for grant of the concession of anticipatory bail which was dismissed as withdrawn as recently as on 05.08.2024 and there had been no material change in circumstances ever since then.

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

5. This is the second petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. filed by the petitioner. The previous petition was dismissed as withdrawn in the following terms:

“After arguing for some time, a prayer was made by learned counsel for the petitioner for withdrawal of the instant petition at this stage.

Dismissed as withdrawn.”

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner has failed to point out any material change in circumstances since the earlier petition for anticipatory bail was withdrawn by him. This Court further concurs with the submissions made by the learned State counsel that the petitioner's role is distinguishable from the co-accused Gaurav, who has been granted the concession of bail, and thus, he cannot claim parity with his co-accused.

7. 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. The petition stands dismissed. 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.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

September 26, 2024
rps

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