



102

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

**CRM-M No.1984 of 2025
Date of Decision: 16.01.2025**

Randhir Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Prabhjot Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Naveen Kumar Mehra, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sumit Jain, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J.

1. Present second petition has been filed praying for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner on the basis of change of circumstances in case bearing FIR No.172, dated 25.03.2023 (Annexure P-1), under Sections 120-B, 406, 420 of IPC, registered at Police Station City Fatehabad, District Fatehabad on the basis of complainant's statement that the petitioner was implicated in false case by police official's, the compromise agreement-cum-complainants statement dated 20.12.2024 (Annexures P-9 & P-10). Further prayer has been made for granting the ad-interim bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the present petition and the petitioner and complainants with the witness



related to the case should be protected from the concerned police officials as they are directly involved in this case and conduct an official inquiry against them for this kind of illegal acts done by them to harass the innocent people and further for exempted the petitioner from filing certified copies of Annexures and permit to place true/translated/typed/print copies thereof on record to meet the ends of justice.

2. Admittedly the petitioner earlier approached this Court by way of filing **CRM-M No.2097 of 2024** praying for the grant of anticipatory bail. This Court after hearing both the sides finding no merit in the petition filed by the petitioner dismissed the same vide order dated 30.09.2024.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has relied upon the judgment passed by this Court in “**Bhisham Singh vs. State of Haryana**”, 2024(3) RCR (Criminal) 65 and has submitted that the present second petition is maintainable. It has been submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that the parties have compromised the matter.

4. Learned counsel for the State however has opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that this Court had rejected the earlier petition filed by the petitioner by passing a detailed order on 30.09.2024 and thus, the present petition is not even maintainable. He has further opposed the petition on merits as well and thus has submitted that the same deserves to be dismissed.



5. The Court has heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record with their able assistance.

6. The Court does not reject this petition filed by the petitioner on its maintainability, however simply because the petitioner has compromised the matter, this Court does not find any ground for taking a different view from the one which was earlier taken by this Court in the petition filed by the petitioner bearing **CRM-M No.2097 of 2024**, which was dismissed vide order dated 30.09.2024.

7. Resultantly, the present petition is hereby dismissed.

16.01.2025

rittu

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

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE