



CRM-M-18859-2026 (O&M) -1-

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

161

**CRM-M-18859-2026
Decided on: 07.04.2026**

SURKHAB SINGH @ YADU @ ROBIN

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present: Mr. Vishal Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Anup Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Kartik Sharma, Advocate for respondents No.2 & 3.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

1. This is the second petition under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023, has been filed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.181 dated 03.08.2024, registered under Sections 109(1), 118(1), 118(2), 238, 3(5) of BNS (initially registered under Sections 109(1), 118(1), 191(1), 190(1) of BNS, 2023; Section 118(2) of BNS was added later on vide DDR No.19 dated 21.08.2024; Section 238 of BNS was added vide DDR No.20 dated 27.09.2024; Sections 191(1), 190 of BNS were deleted and Section 3(5) of BNS were added vide DDR No.28 dated 11.11.2024), at Police Station Model Town, District Hoshiarpur, Punjab, in view of compromise arrived at between the parties vide compromise deed dated 02.03.2026 (Annexure P-7).



2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the instant petition is the second one seeking grant of anticipatory bail due to changed circumstances that the matter has been amicably settled between the parties vide compromise deed dated 02.03.2026 (Annexure P-7). It is further admitted that earlier petition seeking anticipatory bail was dismissed on merits by this Court vide order dated 12.02.2026 passed in CRM-M-8206-2026. It is also contended that quashing petition in the present FIR, on the basis of compromise, bearing CRM-M-16032-2026 is pending for adjudication before a Coordinate Bench of this Court.

3. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State opposed the present petition while submitting that offence under Section 109(1) of BNS (307, IPC) has been attributed to the present petitioner which is non-compoundable and as such, prayed for dismissal of the same.

4. During the course of arguments and on seeing that this Court is not inclined to grant the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, learned counsel for the petitioner prayed for listing of the present petition alongwith the aforementioned connected matter. The same is declined.

5. Heard.

6. The earlier petition seeking concession of anticipatory bail by the petitioner has already been dismissed on merits while passing a detailed order dated 12.02.2026 passed in CRM-M-8206-2026 and the offence(s) involved in the present case are non-compoundable and are against the State. Further, the contention of learned counsel for the



petitioner regarding the pendency of quashing petition on the basis of compromise would lend no help to the case of the petitioner as the same is to be decided after verification of correctness or genuineness of compromise that whether it is a voluntary or is influenced by any coercion.

7. This Court is of the view that a mere compromise cannot be said to be a changed circumstance or a strong reason for entertaining a second bail petition when earlier anticipatory bail petition was dismissed on merits. The Hon'ble Supreme in “**G.R. Ananda Babu v. The State of Tamil Nadu and Another**” [2021 (1) RCR (Criminal) 843] held as under:-

"7. As a matter of fact, successive anticipatory bail applications ought not to be entertained and more so, when the case diary and the status report, clearly indicated that the accused (respondent No. 2) is absconding and not cooperating with the investigation. The specious reason of change in circumstances cannot be invoked for successive anticipatory bail applications, once it is rejected by a speaking order and that too by the same Judge".

8. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts, the present petition is not maintainable and hence, the same is hereby dismissed.

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

07.04.2026

Sonia Puri

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO
Whether Reportable: YES/NO