

101

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

**CRM-M No.42514 of 2023
Date of decision : 05.09.2023**

Resham Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Ms. Jyoti, Advocate with
Ms. Ishita, Advocate
for the petitioner.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J.

Present third petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.158, dated 07.10.2022, under Sections 120-B, 376, 420, 506 of IPC and Section 13 of Punjab Prevention of Human Smuggling Act, 2012, registered at Police Station Kabarwala, District Sri Muktsar Sahib.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted before this Court that co-accused, namely, Kamaljeet Kaur @ Kavaljit Kaur has been granted regular bail by this Court vide order dated 01.08.2023. She submits that hence the petitioner deserves to be granted the concession of anticipatory bail.

On hearing learned counsel for the petitioner and perusing the material on record, it is evident that the petitioner earlier approached the

learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sri Muktsar Sahib praying for grant of anticipatory bail, which was rejected by him vide his order dated 02.01.2023. Thereafter, the petitioner approached this Court by way of filing **CRM-M No.3051 of 2023**, which was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 02.02.2023. Thereafter, the petitioner again approached this Court by way of filing **CRM-M No.24943 of 2023**, which was dismissed by this Court vide order dated 24.05.2023. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner approached the Hon'ble Supreme Court by way of filing **SLP (CrI) No.8366 of 2023**. However, the same was dismissed by Hon'ble the Supreme Court vide order dated 21.07.2023. Thereafter, the petitioner has again approached this Court by way of filing the present petition.

The conduct of the petitioner is self speaking. It is the settled proposition of law that successive anticipatory bails are not maintainable whereas in the present case, the petitioner has lost up to the Hon'ble Supreme Court but he again approached this Court by way of filing the present petition.

The specific argument raised by learned counsel for the petitioner is the parity with the co-accused. However, the co-accused has been granted the regular bail by this Court under Section 439 Cr.P.C. and thus, there is no parity whatsoever in favour of the petitioner, who is before this Court for grant of anticipatory bail.

It is beyond any comprehension of law that once the Hon'ble Supreme Court has dismissed his petition, how the present petition is maintainable before this Court.

This Court is convinced that the petitioner has no respect and regard for the sanctity of the law and thus, deserves to be dealt strictly. Resultantly, the present petition is dismissed with cost of Rs.2,00,000/- (Two lacs) Out of this amount, he would pay Rs.1,00,000/- (One lac) in the account of Poor Patient Welfare Fund, PGIMER, Chandigarh and Rs.1,00,000/- (One Lac) in the Punjab and Haryana High Court Bar Association, Chandigarh within a period of one month from today and submit the receipts thereof to the Registry.

In case the petitioner fails to furnish receipts regarding deposit of abovesaid cost within one month from today, the Registry is directed to list the case as IOIN in the ordinary list for further orders.

At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner prays for withdrawal of the present petition.

The Court finds the prayer made to be totally obnoxious and thus, reject the same out rightly.

05.09.2023

rittu

**(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE**

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