

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

**102**

**CRM-M-37046-2021**

Date of Decision : September 14, 2021

GURMEET SINGH ALIAS MEETU

.....Petitioner

***VERSUS***

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI**

Present : Mr. R.S. Longia, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

**JASGURPREET SINGH PURI. J. (Oral)**

The present petition has been filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.264 dated 21.05.2021 (Annexure P-1) under Section 15(C) of the NDPS Act, 1985 (later-on added Sections 27-A and 29 of the NDPS Act), registered at Police Station City, Kaithal, District Kaithal (Haryana).

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that this is the second petition for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner but the same may be considered in view of the fact that custodial investigation of the petitioner is not required because the entire evidence is based upon hearsay evidence.

I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner.

The petitioner had earlier filed an application for anticipatory bail before this Court vide CRM-M-22766 of 2021, which was decided by way of a detailed order on 10.06.2021. The arguments raised by the learned counsel for the petitioner were considered and decided. The second anticipatory bail application again on similar ground is not maintainable in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***G.R. Ananda Babu Vs. State of Tamil Nadu and another, Criminal Appeal No.84 of 2021 arising out of SLP (Criminal) No.213 of 2021, decided on 28.01.2021.*** The relevant portion of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court is reproduced as under:

*“7. 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.”*

Therefore, this Court does not think it fit and proper to entertain the present petition, which is not maintainable in the eyes of law.

Consequently, the present petition is, hereby, dismissed.

(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)  
JUDGE

September 14, 2021  
ajay-1

|                            |   |        |
|----------------------------|---|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned. | : | Yes/No |
| Whether Reportable.        | : | Yes/No |