



CRM-M-56465-2025

1

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

103

CRM-M-56465-2025

Decided on :10.02.2026

Roop Ram Shukla

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent(s)

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH**

Present: Mr. Manoj Kumar Panchal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*

**SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)**

1. Present second petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, seeking anticipatory bail in connection with FIR No. 365 dated 04.12.2023, under Section 420 IPC, registered at Police Station Zirakpur, SAS Nagar, Mohali.

2. It is noticed that the first anticipatory bail petition, i.e., CRM-M-25871-2024, was filed before this Court and was withdrawn on 29.05.2024 with the following recording:

*“1. Counsel for the petitioner prays for withdrawal of the present petition at this stage.  
2. Petition dismissed as withdrawn.”*

3. Without there being any material change in circumstances, petitioner subsequently moved an application before the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Mohali, which was dismissed on 16.09.2025.

4. Thereafter, petitioner has filed the present second anticipatory bail petition before this Court. It is further observed that

**CRM-M-56465-2025****2**

although the petitioner sought to withdraw the first petition at that stage, no specific observation was recorded in the order disposing of CRM-M-25871-2024.

5. In view of the above, it is clear that the petitioner has already availed the remedy of anticipatory bail through the first petition, which was voluntarily withdrawn without any material change in circumstances. The subsequent approach to this Court through the second petition, without any new grounds, amounts to an attempt to seek repeated relief, which is not permissible in law. Considering the settled principles that a petition under Section 482 CrPC should not be used to circumvent procedural bars or repeatedly approach the Court for the same relief, the present petition is clearly not maintainable. Accordingly, the second anticipatory bail petition before this Court is hereby dismissed. No observation made in the disposal of the earlier petition can be construed as permitting a second petition in the absence of any fresh facts or circumstances.

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)**  
**JUDGE**

**10.02.2026*****Rashmi***

*Whether speaking/reasoned:* Yes/No  
*Whether Reportable:* Yes/No