



106

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

**CRM-M-36554-2026
DECIDED ON: 09.07.2026**

KAMALDEEP**.....PETITIONER**

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER**.....RESPONDENTS****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.**

Present: Mr. Amardeep Singh Mann, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. TPS Walia, Asst. AG, Punjab.

Mr. APS Mann, Advocate, for respondent No.2.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J (ORAL)

1. **Present 2nd petition** has been filed by the petitioner, seeking grant of anticipatory bail, in case, FIR No.153, dated 19.11.2025, under Sections 316(2) of BNS (section 61(2) of BNS and sections 13(1), 13(2) of PC Act added later on) [corresponding to sections 406 of IPC and 120-B of IPC], registered at Police Station Bareta, District Mansa.
2. First petition seeking anticipatory bail filed by the petitioner, i.e. CRM-M-74105-2025, was dismissed by Coordinate Bench of this Court by passing a detailed order dated 17.02.2026 (Annexure P-3).
3. FIR in the present case has been registered against the petitioner, who is the proprietor of M/s Shri Ram Rice and General Mills, for allegedly causing a loss of Rs.2,64,55,145/- to Markfed, Punjab.
4. Prime contention addressed by counsel for the petitioner for maintaining the present second anticipatory bail petition, is that petitioner

has now offered to repay the entire amount along with interest and that, as per the reply received, the said proposal is acceptable to Markfed, Mansa. Since a fresh cause of action constitutes in the present case, prayer for anticipatory bail to the petitioner warrants reconsideration.

5. However, this Court is unable to accept the aforesaid contention made by counsel for the petitioner. Subsequent offer to repay the alleged amount, even if accepted by Markfed, does not constitute a fresh circumstance, so as to maintain a second petition for anticipatory bail, particularly when earlier petition was dismissed by passing a reasoned order dated 17.02.2026 (Annexure P-3). The said order has attained finality, as it was never assailed before the higher Forum, i.e. Hon'ble Supreme Court.

6. Learned State counsel has further informed the Court that, subsequent to the dismissal of first anticipatory bail petition, petitioner was also declared a proclaimed person.

7. Apart from the above, petitioner's willingness to repay the alleged loss suffered by Markfed does not dilute the gravity of alleged offence, if any, arising from the acts complained of. Recovery of the alleged loss is a matter which may be pursued by Markfed through appropriate legal proceedings and cannot, by itself, constitute a ground for grant of anticipatory bail.

8. In view of the aforesaid discussion, this Court finds no ground to entertain the present petition. **Accordingly, present petition is dismissed.**

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

09.07.2026
Lavisha

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>