



CRM-M-67169-2025

-1-

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

**CRM-M-67169-2025**

Decided on: 29.11.2025

Amandeep Kamboj @ Aman Dhot

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

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

Present: Mr. Deepinder Singh Virk, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Ms. Ramta Chowdhary, DAG, Punjab.

**Rajesh Bhardwaj, J.**

1. Prayer in the present second petition is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in a case FIR No.174 dated 03.09.2025, registered under Sections 249 and 253 of BNS, 2023 and Sections 25 and 27 of Arms Act, at Police Station Civil Lines, Patiala.

2. The petitioner earlier approached this Court by way of filing CRM-M-56444-2025, wherein he was granted interim anticipatory bail vide order dated 15.10.2025, subject to condition as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023. However, he did not join the investigation and was granted another opportunity for joining the investigation, but even though he failed to do the needful and ultimately, the said petition was dismissed by this Court vide order dated 13.11.2025. Hence, the petitioner has filed the present second petition for grant of anticipatory bail.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner was falsely implicated in other FIRs and hence, he could not join the investigation in the present FIR as was directed by this Court in the earlier petition.

4. Heard.



CRM-M-67169-2025

-2-

5. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is evident that the present petition is a second petition filed by the petitioner for grant of anticipatory bail, which has been filed only after 16 days of the dismissal of the earlier one. The 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'. It is pertinent to mention that in the earlier petition filed by the petitioner for grant of anticipatory bail, interim anticipatory bail was granted to the petitioner and he was directed to join the investigation, but he failed to do so despite availing repeated adjournments for the said purpose and ultimately, when the Court finds that the petitioner has failed to comply with the direction passed by this Court and also failed to furnish any specific explanation for not joining the investigation, the earlier petition was dismissed on 13.11.2025. Now the present petition has been filed after 16 days from the date of dismissal of the earlier petition. The conduct of the petitioner itself shows he has scant respect for the law and the order passed by this Court. Counsel for the petitioner has failed to point out as to what had prevented him from disclosing the fact of registration of other FIRs against the present petitioner at the time of hearing of the earlier petition.

6. Keeping in view the above-said facts in totality, the Court deems it appropriate to dismiss the present petition with costs of Rs.25,000/- to be paid by the petitioner with the Poor Patients' Welfare Fund, PGIMER, Chandigarh within a period of 15 days from today. The petitioner is directed to submit the receipt with regard of deposit of costs

with the Registry of this Court within a period of 20 days from today.

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

29.11.2025

sharmila

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)

JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned :

Whether Reportable :

Yes/No

Yes/No