



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

105

CRM-M-4516-2025

Date of decision: 27.01.2025

Neeraj Atter

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. Naveen Bawa, Advocate for the petitioner.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner in the instant (second) petition is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short, 'BNSS') in case FIR No.30 dated 26.02.2023 under Sections 406, 420, 120-B of the IPC and Section 13 of the Punjab Travel Professionals (Regulations) Act, 2014 registered at Police Station Shahkot, District Jalandhar.

2. At the outset, a pointed query has been put to the learned counsel for the petitioner as to how the instant petition is maintainable since the previous petition was withdrawn in the following terms vide order dated 04.04.2024 (Annexure P-7):-

“After arguing for some time, when this Court was not inclined to accept the submissions made on behalf of the petitioner, a prayer was made by learned counsel for the petitioner for withdrawal of the instant petition.

Dismissed as withdrawn.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the



CRM-M-4516-2025

petitioner is ready to return the entire amount.

4. Notice of motion.

5. On asking of the Court, Mr. H.S. Deol, Sr. DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf respondent No.1-State.

6. Learned State counsel, on instructions, has submitted that proceedings under Section 82 of the Cr.P.C. are already underway against the petitioner; in addition, the petitioner is involved in seven more criminal cases of identical nature. Learned counsel submits that involvement of the petitioner in multiple criminal cases of identical nature speaks volumes about his illegal activities for which he does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail and his custodial interrogation is now required.

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

8. Prima facie, the petitioner does come across as a habitual offender as he is involved in multiple criminal cases of identical nature. This Court, therefore, does not deem it fit to extend the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. The instant petition stands dismissed accordingly.

9. 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.

27.01.2025

Vinay

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

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