



262

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

CRM-M No.49091 of 2025

Date of Decision:23.01.2026

Baljeet Verma

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Angad Parmar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Raj Karan Singh, Asstt. A.G., Punjab.

Mr. Ramandeep Singh Gill, Advocate and
Mr. Shivam Dang, Advocate
for the complainant.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J.

1. Present third petition has been filed praying for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.39, dated 08.05.2025, under Sections 318(4), 316(2) & 61(2) of BNS, 2023, registered at Police Station Chhajli, District Sangrur, Punjab.

2. Succinctly, the facts of the case are that FIR in the present case dated 08.05.2025 was got registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Ranveer Singh, son of Dev Singh. It was alleged that about 06 months ago, Baljeet Verma had taken the shop on rent from Kuldeep Singh and started the work of goldsmith under the name and



style of Ekam Verma. It was alleged that on 26.02.2025, the complainant along with his wife went to the shop of Baljeet Verma, i.e. the petitioner, for purchasing pure gold and Binder Singh was also accompanying them. The complainant gave an amount of Rs.3,17,000/- in cash, one set of gold necklace and one set of earrings, both weighing about 35 grams, to Baljeet Verma (petitioner) and on account of the same, Baljeet Verma (petitioner) handed over one piece of gold weighing 26 grams to the complainant claiming it to be pure gold. Thereafter, the complainant again asked Baljeet Verma for remaining pure gold, but he flatly refused and thus, the complainant got checked the piece of gold, which was given to him by Baljeet Verma and the same was found to be fake. Thus, the request was made to take legal action against the accused. On the basis of the complaint, the FIR was registered and the investigation commenced. Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sangrur praying for the grant of anticipatory bail. However, after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sangrur declined the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 20.05.2025. Being aggrieved, the petitioner earlier approached this Court twice praying for the grant of anticipatory bail by way of filing CRM-M-32005-2025 and CRM-M-42339-2025, however the same were dismissed as withdrawn vide orders dated 16.07.2025 and 06.08.2025, respectively. Thereafter, the petitioner approached the Hon'ble Supreme Court praying for the grant of anticipatory bail by way of filing Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.)



bearing No.13532 of 2025, however the same was also dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 10.09.2025. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner is again before this Court praying for the grant of anticipatory bail by way of filing the present third petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He has submitted that neither the complainant has any evidence regarding the purchase of gold from the petitioner nor he has any evidence that the complainant has given money in lieu of the gold as alleged. He has further submitted that the present third petition is maintainable and thus the petitioner deserves to be granted anticipatory bail.

4. Learned counsel for the State however has opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that the petitioner was specifically named in the FIR and he was very much involved in the offence. He has further submitted that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature and the investigation is at threshold. He has further submitted that no case for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner is made out and thus, the present petition deserves to be dismissed.

5. Learned counsel for the complainant however has opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that the petitioner had committed a grave offence, wherein he cheated the complainant by giving the piece of gold, which was found to be fake. He has further submitted that the bail petitions of the petitioner



were dismissed by this Court twice and also by Hon'ble the Supreme Court. He has thus submitted that no case for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner is made out and thus the present petition deserves to be dismissed.

6. Heard.

7. Perusal of the record would show that anticipatory bail petitions filed by the petitioner bearing CRM-M-32005-2025 and CRM-M-42339-2025 were dismissed as withdrawn, when this Court was not inclined to grant any relief to the petitioner, vide orders dated 16.07.2025 and 06.08.2025, respectively. Thus, it is apparent that the submissions made before this Court by learned counsel for the petitioner had already been taken into consideration by this Court while dealing with his earlier petitions. Thereafter, he filed anticipatory bail application before the Hon'ble Supreme Court bearing Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.) bearing No.13532 of 2025, however the same was also dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 10.09.2025. Hence, this is the third petition filed by the petitioner praying for the grant of anticipatory bail.

8. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perused the record, it is apparent that this is the third petition filed by the petitioner praying for the grant of anticipatory bail. As per the allegations, the complainant along with his wife and Binder Singh went to the shop of petitioner for purchasing the pure gold and he gave an amount of Rs.3,17,000/- in cash along with the jewellery weighing about 35 grams to the petitioner and on account of the same, the petitioner gave a piece

of gold weighing 26 grams to the complainant stating it to be pure gold but it was found to be fake and thus, the complainant found that the petitioner along with other co-accused has cheated the complainant for huge amount.

9. Learned counsel for the petitioner has failed to satisfy the Court the change in circumstances from the earlier petition filed.

10. There is no gainsaying that the present petition has been filed by the petitioner praying for the grant of anticipatory bail. Learned counsel for the petitioner has failed to convince this Court on the change of circumstances on the basis of which, the present petition could be entertained. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in G.R. Ananda Babu Vs. State of Tamil Nadu, 2021(1) RCR (Criminal) 843 has held that successive anticipatory bail applications ought not to be entertained on specious ground of 'Changed Circumstances'.

11. Thus keeping in view the above said position, this Court neither find the petition maintainable nor find any merit in the present petition and hence, the same being devoid of any merit is hereby dismissed.

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

23.01.2026

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