



CRM-M-37611-2026

1

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

111

**CRM-M-37611-2026
Decided on:14.07.2026**

Anshu @ Omparkash

.....Appellant

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH**Present: Mr. Vinay Puri, Advocate for the appellant.**

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. Present petition, being the third one, has been filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS) seeking the grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No. 25 dated 31.01.2026, registered under Sections 115(2), 118(1), 109, 126, 351(2), 191(3) and 190 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (corresponding to Sections 323, 324, 307, 341, 352, 148 and 149 of the IPC) at Police Station Nangal, District Rupnagar.

2. After registration of the FIR on 31.01.2026, petitioner, Anshu @ Om Parkash, initially approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Rupnagar, seeking anticipatory bail. Said petition was dismissed by a detailed order dated 02.04.2026 (Annexure P-3).

3. Thereafter, petitioner approached this Court by filing CRM-M-20805-2026. Coordinate Bench of this Court, vide order dated

**CRM-M-37611-2026****2**

22.04.2026 (Annexure P-4), while issuing notice of motion, granted interim protection to the petitioner subject to his joining the investigation. However, petitioner failed to comply with the said direction and did not join the investigation. Consequently, petition was dismissed as withdrawn on 18.05.2026 (Annexure P-5).

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has referred to the order dated 25.05.2026 (Annexure P-6) passed by the learned Judge, Special Court, Rupnagar, whereby petitioner was granted interim bail in another case, namely FIR No. 181 dated 16.10.2025, registered under Sections 115(2), 117(2), 127(2), 140(3), 307, 191(3) and 238 of the BNS at Police Station Nangal. It is contended that on account of his custody/proceedings in the said case, petitioner could not join the investigation pursuant to the interim order dated 22.04.2026 passed by this Court.

5. Subsequently, petitioner again approached this Court by filing a second anticipatory bail petition, i.e., CRM-M-34763-2026. Said petition was disposed of as not pressed vide order dated 26.06.2026, with liberty to the petitioner to approach the Court below in view of the subsequent developments that had taken place after the withdrawal of the earlier petition.

6. Pursuant thereto, petitioner again filed an application seeking anticipatory bail before the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Rupnagar. However, said application was dismissed vide order dated 03.07.2026. While dismissing the application, learned Court observed

**CRM-M-37611-2026****3**

that although the petitioner was allegedly armed with a *dattar*, no specific injury had been attributed to him.

7. This is the third attempt made by the petitioner before this Court seeking the concession of anticipatory bail. Earlier, his application was dismissed by the Court of Sessions, and thereafter, despite having been granted interim protection by this Court, he failed to comply with the condition requiring him to join the investigation. His second petition before this Court was also withdrawn. In these circumstances, present successive petition is not maintainable.

Accordingly, present petition is dismissed as not maintainable.

8. However, it is observed that in case petitioner surrenders before the Court concerned within a period of ten days from today and files an application seeking bail, same shall be considered and decided expeditiously, in accordance with law. In the event the Court concerned finds that no active role or specific injury is attributable to the petitioner, it shall endeavour to decide the bail application, preferably within two days from the date of its filing.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

14.07.2026
rashmi

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: **YES/NO**
Whether Reportable: **YES/NO**