



216

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

CRM-M No.17173 of 2026
Date of Decision: 23.04.2026

Samedeen @ Dr. Sameer**..... Petitioner****Versus****State of Haryana****..... Respondents****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ**

Present: Mr. Sunny Tyagi, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, A.A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Balwan Singh, Advocate
for the complainant.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J.

1. Present third petition has been filed praying for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.571, dated 19.09.2025, under Sections 120-B, 406 & 420 of IPC, registered at Police Station Gharaunda, Karnal.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted before this Court that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He submits that the petitioner has no concern with the alleged offence. He submits that there is no specific allegation against the petitioner that he fraudulently collected money from anyone. He submits that there is no



record of any financial benefit having accrued to the petitioner rather he himself is the victim as he and his family members also invested in the Company and thus, prosecution of the petitioner in the present case is nothing but an abuse of the process of the Court.

3. Vakalatnama on behalf of the complainant has been filed today in the Court, which is taken on record. He has opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner and submit that the petitioner had earlier approached this Court twice by way of filing CRM-M No.59942 of 2025 and CRM-M-8229-2026, which were dismissed on merits by this Court vide orders dated 22.01.2026 and 12.02.2026, respectively.

4. Learned State counsel has filed Status report by way of affidavit of Mr. Rajiv Kumar, HPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, City, Karnal has been filed on behalf of respondent-State in the Court, same is taken on record and submits that the petitioner is a habitual offender who is facing prosecution in 05 more cases for committing the crime of similar nature. He 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 petitioner and perusing the record, it is apparent that the petitioner had earlier approached this Court twice by way of filing CRM-M No.59942 of 2025 and CRM-M-8229-2026, which were dismissed on merits by this Court vide orders




dated 22.01.2026 and 12.02.2026. The earlier second petition for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner was dismissed by observing the following:-

“From perusing the order passed by this Court earlier on 22.01.2026, it is apparent that the petitioner along with his co-accused had duped the complainants for a huge amount. Though the petitioner has already settled the matter with one of the complainants, as submitted by counsel for the petitioner, however, there are more than 10 complainants in the present FIR. The petitioner is a habitual offender who is facing prosecution in other cases as well for committing the crime of same nature. 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.”

7. From perusing the orders passed by this Court earlier on 22.01.2026 and 12.02.2026, it is apparent that the petitions were dismissed on merits. 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 petitions.

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.

23.04.2026

ps-I

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

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE