

**IN THE COURT OF AMANDEEP KAUR CHAHAL (UID No. PB0248)
ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE, TARN TARAN**

BA 1671-26
Decided on: 21.5.2026

Jaspreet Singh @ Jassa son of Tarlok Singh, aged about 36 years r/o Harike,
Tehsil Patti District Tarn Taran.

..... Applicant

Versus

State of Punjab

FIR No.20 of 2.3.2017

Under section: 279/506/338/295/148/149 of IPC

Police Station: Harike

(Bail Application for grant of bail under Section 482 BNSS)

Present: - Sh.HS Sandu, Adv. Counsel for the accused/applicant
Sh. Sandeep Kumar, Addl. PP for the State

ORDER

1 This order shall dispose of bail application U/Sec.482 of BNSS filed by the applicant/accused in case FIR no.20 of 2.3.2017, under Sections 279/506/338/295/148/149 of IPC, registered at P.S Harike.

2. Notice of the bail application was issued to the State and police record was requisitioned.

3. Report of investigating officer alongwith the Additional Public Prosecutor about pendency of or of any former adjudication of bail application before or by any Court under the provisions of BNSS and the result thereof was called upon. It was reported that except the present FIR, 24 FIRs have been registered against the applicant-accused and no any application relating to this case has been decided or pending in any other court of competent jurisdiction.

Statement in this regard of ASI Sukhdev Singh also recorded. Such a declaration is also contained in the bail application.

4. Ahlmad had also reported that the bail application of accused Manpreet Singh was allowed on 28.2.2019.

5. Learned counsel for the accused/applicant argued that applicant/accused is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. The applicant-accused has been declared proclaimed offender vide order dated 16.12.2024 but the procedure U/Sec.82 Cr.P.C has not been followed as no clear 30 days period has been given to the accused to appear before the court. The applicant/accused has further contended that he would not tamper with the prosecution evidence and will not abscond from the trial court and would appear on each and every date of hearing and shall not misuse the concession of bail and will abide by all the terms and conditions as laid down under Section 482 BNSS or as imposed by the court and finally, it has been prayed that the applicant/accused may be granted bail.

6. On the other hand, while controverting the contentions put-forth by the counsel for accused, ld. APP for the State argued that the accused has been already declared proclaimed offender vide order dated 16.12.2024 and the anticipatory bail in such like cases is not maintainable. He further argued that if the concession of bail is granted to the applicant/accused, he may try to influence the prosecution witness. Hence, the applicant/accused does not deserve the leniency of the court and should not be granted relief of bail.

7. Perusal of file reveals that Jaspreet Singh was granted bail by the trial court on 28.2.2019 and thereafter, the challan was presented against all the

accused on 6.1.2021. Accused Jaspreet Singh was appearing before the court but on 28.8.2024 he absented himself from the proceedings of the court and consequently his bail bonds and surety bonds were canceled on 11.9.2024. Though his bail order was not canceled but due to his absence, the proceedings U/Sec.82 of Cr.P.C was issued against accused and ultimately on 16.12.2024 the accused was declared proclaimed person/offender. He absented himself from the proceedings of the court from 28.8.2024 to 16.12.2024 i.e. till he was declared proclaimed offender and now application for anticipatory bail has been moved by the applicant-accused. The order passed by the Magistrate wherein the accused has been declared proclaimed offender/person has yet not been challenged by the accused in any other court of competent jurisdiction. The accused has also not produced any document to prove his bona-fides that his absence from the court was on account of any urgency. As per the police record, there are 24 other FIRs registered against the accused. No document has been placed on record to prove his bonafide. It appears that his absence was deliberate. In absence of any such evidence on record, the court is not inclined to grant bail to applicant/accused, who remained absented from the court intentionally. In such a scenario, the court does not deem it expedite to grant him bail.

8 The accused has been declared proclaimed offender/person vide order dated 16.12.2024 and hence, the anticipatory bail by a proclaimed person is not maintainable, therefore, the application is liable to be dismissed on this ground also.

9. Consequently his bail application is dismissed. Bail application be consigned to the record room and file be sent back to the concerned court, immediately.

**Pronounced in open court
on:21.5.2026**

Poonam (JW)

**Amandeep Kaur Chahal
Additional Sessions Judge
Tarn Taran/UID-PB0248**

Present: - Sh.HS Sandu, Adv. Counsel for the accused/applicant
Sh. Sandeep Kumar, Addl. PP for the State

Arguments heard. Vide my separate detailed order of even date, the present bail application stands dismissed. Bail application be consigned to the record room and file be sent back to the concerned court, immediately.

Pronounced in open court
on:21.5.2026

Poonam (JW)

Amandeep Kaur Chahal
Additional Sessions Judge
Tarn Taran/UID-PB0248