

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-73720-2025
DECIDED ON: 26.12.2025

PARKASH SINGHPETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJABRESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.

Present: Mr. Dinesh Ghai, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer in this petition, filed 3rd time, under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name & age of Petitioner (s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Parkash Singh, aged about 40 years	124	19.05.2025	109, 115(2), 191(3), 190, 351(2) of BNS and Section 25 of Arms Act	Sadar Fazilka	Fazilka

2. First anticipatory bail petition, i.e. CRM-M-32701-2025, filed by the petitioner Parkash Singh along with his other co-accused, was dismissed by the coordinate Bench of this Court (Manjari Nehru Kaul, J.) by passing a detailed order dated 10.07.2025 (Annexure P-14).

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner fairly concedes that second anticipatory bail petition, i.e. CRM-M-61195-2025, filed by the petitioner along with the other accused, was also dismissed by another

coordinate Bench of this Court (Rajesh Bhardwaj, J.), vide order dated 08.12.2025 (Annexure P-15). While dismissing the said petition, the Court recorded a specific finding that there was no change in circumstances and successive anticipatory bail applications cannot be entertained on the specious plea of changed circumstances. Consequently, the said petition was held to be not maintainable, by placing reliance upon the judgment passed in the case of *G.R. Ananda Babu v. State of Tamil Nadu, 2021 (1) RCR (Criminal) 843*.

4. In an attempt to demonstrate a fresh cause of action, counsel for the petitioner has placed reliance upon the anticipatory bail orders passed by another coordinate Bench of this Court (Jasjit Singh Bedi, J.) dated 22.08.2025 and 22.09.2025, passed in CRM-M-46039-2025 (Annexures P-17 and P-18 respectively), whereby co-accused Raj Singh was granted anticipatory bail.

5. However, since the said orders (Annexures P-17 and P-18) were passed prior to the dismissal of the second anticipatory bail petition of the petitioner, vide order dated 08.12.2025 (Annexure P-15), the question arises as to how the present third anticipatory bail petition can be held to be maintainable on the basis of those earlier orders.

6. Faced with the aforesaid situation, learned counsel for the petitioner seeks permission to withdraw the present petition.

7. This Court was inclined to impose costs upon the petitioner; however, taking a lenient view, present petition is dismissed as withdrawn.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

26.12.2025

Lavisha

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>