

103
IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-18432-2022
Date of Decision: 09.05.2022

Angrej Singh

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI

Present: Mr. N.S. Kamboj, Advocate, for the petitioner.

JASGURPREET SINGH PURI, J. (Oral)

The present is the second petition filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 31 dated 24.01.2020, under Sections 353, 341, 186, 506, 149 IPC, registered at Police Station City Faridkot, District Faridkot.

It has been submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and there was no specific allegation against the petitioner. He further submitted that earlier an application for grant of anticipatory bail under Section 438 Cr.P.C was filed by the petitioner alongwith his wife Sukhwinder Kaur and vide Annexure P-3 bail was granted to his wife Sukhwinder Kaur but so far as the petitioner is concerned, he was not granted anticipatory bail and as per Annexure P-3 it was observed that the petitioner does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail and his wife was granted bail only on the

ground that she is a lady.

I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner.

The earlier anticipatory bail filed by the petitioner was dismissed on merit on 14.02.2020 vide Annexure P-3. The second petition filed by the petitioner without any strong or cogent reason for the same or any supervening or special circumstance 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]***. The relevant paragraphs of the aforesaid judgment is reproduced as under:-

“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”.

A perusal of the present petition as well as the arguments of the learned counsel for the petitioner suggest that there is no supervening or special circumstance as to how the second petition would be maintainable.

Consequently, the present petition is dismissed.

09.05.2022

rakesh

(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)

JUDGE

Whether speaking	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No