



e CRM-M-41054-2025 (O&M) 1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

214

CRM-M-41054-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision :15.09.2025

Boota Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present : Ms. Indu Bala, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Jatinder Pal Singh, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J. (Oral):

1. This is a second petition filed by the petitioner for anticipatory bail filed, under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in a case arising out of FIR No.0092 dated 21.05.2024 registered under Sections 420 and 120-B IPC, Police Station Sadar, Sri Muktsar Sahib, District Sri Muktsar Sahib.

2. The first petition was dismissed on 09.07.2025, while observing that the matter was argued by learned counsel for the petitioner at some length and then it was withdrawn with liberty to file a fresh petition with better particulars. A bare perusal of the contents of the present petition shows that there is no remarkable or significant change in the particulars furnished in the former petition and the present petition. Otherwise also, the contents of the FIR shows that allegations against the petitioner are of duping the complainant who had purchased two vehicles, for a sum of Rs.15 Lakhs. The *modus operandi*



attributed to the petitioner is that he sold two vehicles to the complainant by making false representation to the effect that vehicles were free from all encumbrances. According to the complainant lateron, he came to know that there was a loan of Rs.15 Lakhs on the above-mentioned vehicles. According to complainant, he has been cheated by the petitioner and his accomplice by making a false representation.

- 3. Heard.
- 4. It has been contended by the learned counsel for the petitioner that there is a delay in lodging the FIR. According to the learned counsel for the petitioner, the vehicles were sold in the year 2021 but the FIR has been lodged in 2024. Except the above-mentioned ground, no other ground has been raised by the learned counsel for the petitioner.
- 5. *Per contra*, the learned State counsel argues that the offence allegedly committed by the petitioner is punishable with an imprisonment to 7 years and therefore, bar of limitation is not attracted at this stage.

Since this is second petition for anticipatory bail and there is no significant change in the circumstances from the date of dismissal of former application, the present petition is not maintainable. Hence, the same is hereby dismissed.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

15.09.2025
anil

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