



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

102

CRM-M-14072-2026 (O&M)

Date of decision: 20.05.2026

Sukhpreet Singh

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Lupil Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Sr. DAG Punjab.

Mr. Manpreet Singh Rai, Advocate for the complainant.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

This second petition has been filed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No. 191 dated 17.11.2025 for offence(s) under Sections 420, 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 registered at Police Station Jaitu, District Faridkot, after earlier petition i.e. CRM-M-4240-2026 was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 27.01.2026 passed by this Court after having argued the matter at length and on being confronted with the circumstances that existed against the petitioner.

2. Counsel for the petitioner was confronted with the factum of maintainability of the second petition for grant of anticipatory bail to which his response was that at the time of earlier petition for anticipatory bail i.e. CRM-M-4240-2026 was filed, certain pleadings pertaining to civil suit had not been appended and that now he has appended the pleadings that had

been initiated. He relies upon the order dated 30.03.2017 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Criminal Appeal No.615 of 2017 arising out of Special Leave Petition (Crl.) No.2406 of 2017, in the matter of 'Rani Dudeja Vs. State of Haryana' to contend that the second petition for anticipatory bail should not be dismissed at the threshold on the ground of maintainability and that under changed circumstances, the second petition for anticipatory bail be maintainable.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has been confronted with fact that the pleadings which are now being appended alongwith the present petition are dated prior to the institution of the earlier petition for anticipatory bail and decision thereof, hence, merely because he choses to now change his line of argument, as to whether the same could be construed as a material change of circumstances as contemplated. He is not in a position to dispute that a change of argument could not be equated to a change of circumstances. Further, he has also been confronted with the ***Division Bench's judgment*** dated ***30.01.2023*** of this Court passed in ***CRM-M-40916-2022*** titled as '***Manjinder Kaur Vs. State of Punjab***' and other ***connected matters***, wherein it was specifically held that after first petition/application is withdrawn, the second or subsequent petition/application would not be maintainable merely on the ground that some new inconsequential and cosmetic change in circumstances has/have come about. Further developments such as arrest of co-accused or main accuse or bail granted to co-accused, different considerations, some more details, new documents or illness of the accused, would also not be a material change of circumstances. The petitioner merely relies upon a

different consideration by adding some additional documents which relate to the proceedings that took place much prior to the institution of the earlier petition for anticipatory bail, hence, they were in existence and are deemed to be in the knowledge of the petitioner at the time when the earlier petition for grant of anticipatory bail was filed.

4. A mere change of argument and reliance on additional documents which pre-date the institution of the earlier petition would not amount to a material change of circumstances.

5. Consequently, the present petition is ***dismissed on the grounds of maintainability.***

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

20.05.2026

Mangal Singh

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