

CRM-M-58282-2025

-1-

**171+401 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

Decided on: 08.12.2025**(1) CRM-M-58282-2025**

Kuldeep Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

(2) CRM-M-61195-2025

Ravinder Singh @ Narinder Singh @ Bobby and another

..... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. K.B. Raheja, Advocate, for the petitioners.


Mr.Raj Karan Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J.

1. This order shall dispose of above-mentioned petitions as both have been arisen out of a common FIR.

2. Prayer in the present second petition is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in a case FIR No.124 dated 19.05.2025, registered under Sections 109, 115(2), 191(3), 190, 351(2) of BNS, 2023 and Section 25 of the Arms Act, at Police Station Sadar Fazilka, District Fazilka.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners has contended that the petitioners earlier approached this Court by way of filing CRM-M-32701-2025 and CRM-M-34238-2025 for the grant of anticipatory bail, however, this Court declined the same vide order dated 10.07.2025. He submits that co-accused Raj Singh has been granted anticipatory bail by this Court vide order dated 22.09.2025 and thus, there is material change in the circumstances and thus, the present second petitions are maintainable. He



CRM-M-58282-2025


-2-

has submitted that there is a substantial change in the circumstances for approaching this Court by way of filing the second petitions and hence, the petitioners deserve the concession of anticipatory bail. He has relied upon the judgments in Rani Dudeja vs. State of Haryana, 2017 Cri. L.R. (SC) 335; Bhisham Singh vs. State of Haryana, passed in CRM-M-13315-2024 decided on 09.04.2024; Gurpeet Singh @ Gora vs. State of Punjab, passed in CRM-M-17658-2025 decided on 02.04.2025 and Joseph Paul vs. Shelly Dhall w/o of Sanjesh, passed in CRWP-2438-2004 decided on 11.03.2005.

3. However, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioners. He has submitted that there are serious allegations against the petitioners and co-accused in causing injuries to the complainant with deadly weapons like sword, kappa, gandasa and pistol and custodial interrogation of the petitioners is required for a free and fair investigation. He, thus, submits that the petitioners do not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

4. After hearing learned counsel for the parties, it is deciphered that the petitioners alongwith the co-accused are involved in heinous offence. The petitioners earlier approached this Court for the grant of anticipatory bail, however, this Court by passing a detailed order dated 10.07.2025, declined the same. There is no dispute regarding the judgments relied upon by learned counsel for the petitioners, however, in the facts and circumstances of the case, the same are distinguishable.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioners had primarily taken a plea of change in circumstance on account of grant of anticipatory bail to co-



CRM-M-58282-2025

-3-

accused Raj Singh for the maintainability of the present second petition. Petitions filed by the petitioners for the grant of anticipatory bail have already been dismissed by this Court vide a detailed order dated 10.07.2025. Thus, this Court does find that no ground for change of circumstances is made out in the present case. Hon'ble Supreme Court in **G.R. Ananda 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'. Thus finding no merit in the present petitions, the same are hereby dismissed being not maintainable.

6. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

08.12.2025

sharmila

**(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE**

Whether Speaking/Reasoned :	Yes/No
Whether Reportable :	Yes/No