

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(103)

2023:PHHC:075705
CRM-M-25852-2023
Date of Decision: 22.05.2023

Neetu Kumar & another

--Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana & another

--Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ.

Present:- Mr. G.S. Sandhu, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. B.S. Virk, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ.J (Oral)

This is the second petition filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C seeking the benefit of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in case FIR No.373 dated 6.4.2022 under sections 346 IPC and 376(2)(n), 376(D), 323, 328, 506, 120-B I.P.C (which were added later on), registered at Police Station, Barwala, District Hisar.

Petitioners had earlier approached this court by way of filing CRM-M-39670-2022 praying for grant of anticipatory bail, however, the same was dismissed vide order dated 2.9.2022.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that now complainant and her husband Gaurav Kumar have decided that as they cannot live their life together, they will take divorce. He submits that due to this change in circumstances, anticipatory bail may be granted to the petitioners.

After hearing learned counsel for the petitioners, this court finds that the earlier petition filed by the petitioners seeking benefit of anticipatory bail i.e. CRM-M-39670-2022 has already been declined by this

court vide order dated 2.9.2022.

Hon'ble Supreme Court in case of *G.R. Anand Babu Vs. State of Tamil Nadu, 2021(1) RCR (Criminal) 843* has held that successive anticipatory bail applications ought not to be entertained on specious ground of changed circumstances.

Resultantly, the petition being devoid of any merit is hereby dismissed.

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

22.05.2023

lucky

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