



109

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

CRM-M No.72803 of 2025

Date of Decision: 23.12.2025

Lovepreet Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Kulwinder Singh Dhillon, Advocate
for the petitioner.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J.

1. Present second petition has been filed praying for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.233, dated 01.09.2025, under Sections 21(C), 29/61 of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 registered at Police Station Anti Narcotics Force, District Amritsar.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted before this Court that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case on the basis of disclosure statement made by co-accused, which is not even an admissible evidence. He submits that the recovery in the present case has been effected from the co-accused and not from the petitioner. He submits that the petitioner is not even name in the FIR and thus, prosecution of the petitioner in the present case is nothing but an abuse of the process of the Court.



3. Notice of motion.

4. On the asking of the Court, Ms. Ramta Chowdhary, D.A.G., Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. She has opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner and submits that the petitioner had earlier approached this Court by way of filing CRM-M No.69440 of 2025 which was dismissed as withdrawn by this Court vide order dated 10.12.2025. She has submitted that no case for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner is made out and thus the present petition being non maintainable deserves to be dismissed.

5. Heard.

6. On hearing learned counsel for the parties, it is apparent that the petitioner earlier approached this Court by way of filing CRM-M No.69440 of 2025 praying for the grant of anticipatory bail, which was allowed to be dismissed as withdrawn by this Court vide order dated 10.12.2025 by passing the following order, which is as under:

“After arguing for some time, learned counsel for the petitioner prays for withdrawal of the present petition, with liberty to surrender before the trial Court and file an appropriate bail application and also prays that the trial Court may be directed to decide his bail application in a time bound manner.

Allowed to do so..

Dismissed as withdrawn, with liberty as prayed for. If the petitioner surrenders before the trial Court within a period of seven days from today and files an appropriate application for bail then the trial Court shall decide the same within a period of seven days from the date of filing thereof, in accordance with law.”



7. From perusing the order passed by this Court earlier on 10.12.2025, it is apparent that the petitioner had withdrawn the earlier petition for grant of anticipatory bail with liberty to surrender before the trial Court and would file an appropriate application, however, the same has not been done so far. Thus, it is apparent that the submissions made before this Court by learned counsel for the petitioner had already been taken into consideration by this Court while dealing with his earlier petition.

8. There is no gainsaying that the present petition has been filed by the petitioner praying for the grant of anticipatory bail. Learned counsel for the petitioner has failed to convince this Court on the change of circumstances on the basis of which, the present petition could be entertained. 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'.

9. Thus this Court is of the opinion that the present petition is not maintainable and hence, the same being devoid of any merit is hereby dismissed.

23.12.2025

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

ps-I

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