

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

CRM-M-20307-2021 (O&M)

Date of decision: 21.05.2021

Anil Malik

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE H.S. MADAAN

Present: Mr. Ramesh Malik, Advocate for the petitioner.

H.S. MADAAN, J.

Case taken up through video conferencing.

This second petition for pre-arrest bail has been filed by petitioner Anil Malik, an accused in FIR No.746 dated 05.11.2020, for offences under Sections 61 and 72-F of Punjab Excise Act, 1914 (Sections 420, 328, 272 IPC and Sections 61-4-20, 72-F, 72(A), 4-20 of Excise Act added later on), registered with Police Station Sonipat City, District Sonipat.

His such petition filed earlier had been dismissed by this Court vide order dated 25.02.2021 in CRM-M-9009-2021, copy of which being Annexure P3.

The Apex Court in judgment **G.R. Ananda Babu Vs. The State of Tamil Nadu & Anr.** arising out of SLP (Crl.) No.213-2021

has categorically observed that “As a matter of fact, successive

anticipatory bail applications ought not to be entertained and more so, when the case diary and the status report, clearly indicated that the accused (respondent No. 2) is absconding and not cooperating with the investigation. The specious reason of change in circumstances cannot be invoked for successive anticipatory bail applications, once it is rejected by a speaking order and that too by the same Judge.”

In the instant case, the first petition had been dismissed vide a detailed and speaking order by this Court. There is absolutely no reason to entertain the second petition for pre-arrest bail, rather the same is not maintainable and is dismissed accordingly.

21.05.2021

sumit.k

(H.S. MADAAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No