

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

128

CRM-M-52532-2024

Date of decision: 22.10.2024

Baba Maan Singh alias Maan Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. Saurabh Arora, Advocate for the petitioner.

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.238 dated 23.11.2023 under Sections 302, 307, 332, 333, 353, 186, 148, 149, 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, 1959 registered at Police Station Sultanpur Lodhi, District Kapurthala.

2. At the very outset, a specific query was posed to the learned counsel for the petitioner regarding the maintainability of the present petition, as it was the second one filed under Section 438 of the Cr.P.C. In response, the learned counsel merely contended that the case against the petitioner was based on a blatantly false and fabricated narrative, driven by political motivations. It was further submitted that the opposite party was seeking to gain control of the Gurudwara, with the assistance of the police, by attempting to interfere in purely religious affairs.

3. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and perused the relevant material on record.

4. The previous petition filed by the petitioner seeking similar relief, was dismissed as withdrawn on 24.07.2024, in the following terms:-

“After arguing for some time, when this Court was not inclined to extend the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner has made a prayer for withdrawal of the instant petition.

Dismissed as withdrawn.”

5. In the light of the above order, this Court posed a specific question to learned counsel for the petitioner regarding any material change in circumstances since the passing of the earlier order dated 24.07.2024. However, learned counsel was unable to draw the attention of this Court to any material, let alone significant, change in circumstances that would warrant acceptance of the instant petition.

6. Accordingly, the instant petition stands 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.

22.10.2024

Vinay

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

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