



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

CRM-M-31630-2026

Date of Decision: 29.05.2026

Vijay @ Vijay Kumar

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Dr. Parminder Kaur, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr.K.D.Sachdeva, DAG, Punjab.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J.

1. This is the third petition for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in a case FIR No.94 dated 17.05.2024, registered under Section 18 of NDPS Act, 1985 (Section 29 of the NDPS Act added lateron), at Police Station City-2, Khanna, District Ludhiana.

2. The petitioner earlier approached this Court by of filing CRM-M-31566-2024 and CRM-M-27722-2025, which were dismissed on merits/dismissed vide orders dated 04.09.2024 and 27.05.2025, respectively. Now the petitioner has filed third petition for grant of anticipatory bail after a gap of about 01 year and there is no change in the circumstances in the present case. However, learned counsel for the petitioner has failed to point out any material change in facts or circumstances arising subsequent to the dismissal of the earlier petition.

3. It is well settled that a successive petition for anticipatory bail is not maintainable in the absence of a substantial change in circumstances. Mere passage of time or reiteration of earlier submissions cannot be construed as a change in circumstance so as to invoke the jurisdiction of this



Court again. Entertaining such petitions without any fresh grounds would amount to a review of the earlier order, which is impermissible in law.

4. The Hon’ble Supreme Court in G.R. Ananda Babu vs. State of Tamil Nadu, 2021(1) RCR (Criminal) 843, has categorically held that successive anticipatory bail applications ought not to be entertained on the specious plea of “changed circumstances” unless there are substantial and compelling new grounds.

5. In the present case, since no such change in circumstance has been demonstrated and the issues raised stand substantially covered by the earlier order passed by this Court, the present petition is held to be not maintainable. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed as such.

29.05.2026
sharmila

Whether Speaking/Reasoned
Whether Reportable

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

: Yes/No
: Yes/No