



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

(Sr. No.103)

CRM-M No. 41489 of 2024

Date of decision : 30.08.2024

Krishanjeet Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL

Present : Mr. Rishav Singla, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Kumar Goyal, Addl. A. G., Punjab.

* * *

DEEPAK SIBAL, J. (Oral)

(1) This is the second petition filed by the petitioner seeking therein anticipatory bail in FIR No.120 dated 27.08.2020 registered under Sections 323, 341, 506, 148, 149 and 379-B IPC at Police Station City Samana, Distt. Patiala.

(2) The first petition filed by the petitioner seeking therein anticipatory bail being **CRM-M No.34781 of 2020 – Krishan @ Krishanjeet Singh Vs. State of Punjab**, on the request made by learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, was dismissed as withdrawn on 30.10.2020 through the following order:-

“Case taken up through Video Conferencing.

The arguments raised on behalf of the petitioner having not received a favourable response from the Bench and not to invite a decision on merits lest it may prejudice the case of the petitioner, learned counsel for the petitioner seeks to withdraw the present petition.

Permitted to do so.

Dismissed as withdrawn.”



(3) Through the instant petition, the petitioner has again approached this Court for the relief which he could not secure on the earlier occasion.

(4) Admittedly, there is no change in circumstance after the passing of the afore quoted order.

(5) Through its order dated 16.12.2021 passed in *Special Leave Petition No.9449 of 2021 - Md. Shamim Khan Vs. The State of Jharkhand*, the Supreme Court has deprecated the practice of filing of subsequent petitions for anticipatory bail after the rejection of earlier one(s) without there being any change in circumstance.

(6) Dismissed.

(7) There is yet another aspect arising out of the matter. Over four years have passed after the lodging of the aforesaid FIR against the petitioner but in the same neither the petitioner has been arrested nor proceedings to declare him a proclaimed offender have been initiated against him.

(8) Let S.S.P., Patiala appear before this Court on the adjourned date to explain the delay in arrest of the petitioner and as to why till date no proceedings have been initiated against him to declare him a proclaimed offender.

(9) List on 04.10.2024.

30.08.2024

sunil yadav

(DEEPAK SIBAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes / No

Whether reportable : Yes / No