

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

**Criminal Misc. No. M-13194 of 2015
Date of Decision: 19.5.2015**

Ramesh Kumar

--Petitioner.

Vs.

State of Punjab

--Respondent.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK

Present : Mr. Vaibhav Narang, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. K.D.Sachdeva, Additional A.G. Punjab.

Mr. Rohit Verma, Advocate
for the complainant.

RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK J. (ORAL)

Petitioner seeks pre-arrest bail in FIR No. 26 dated 3.2.2015 under Sections 323/324/34 IPC (Section 326 IPC was added later on), registered at Police Station Gate Hakima, District Amritsar, City.

Notice of motion was issued and interim protection was granted to the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of the order passed by this Court, petitioner has joined the investigation and he is no more required for any further investigation. He prays for allowing the present petition.

Learned counsel for the State, on instructions from ASI Balwinder Singh, Police Station Gate Hakima, submits that although

the petitioner has joined the investigation but he did not cooperate with the investigating agency. Nothing could be recovered from the petitioner because of his non-cooperation. He prays for dismissal of the present petition.

Similarly, learned counsel for the complainant submits that the petitioner has misused the concession of interim anticipatory bail in connivance with his co-accused, i.e. his wife namely Surekha. He prays for dismissal of the petition.

Having heard the learned counsel for the parties, after careful perusal of the record of the case and giving thoughtful consideration to the rival contentions raised, this Court is of the considered opinion that in the given fact situation of the present case noticed hereinabove, petitioner has not been found entitled for the concession of anticipatory bail. It is so said, because the petitioner, as a matter of fact, has misused the concession of interim anticipatory bail granted by this Court, which leaves the petitioner disentitled for the discretionary relief, at the hands of this Court.

In view of the above and without commenting any further on the merits of the case, lest it should prejudice the rights of either of the parties, custodial interrogation of the petitioner would be a compulsive necessity of the investigating agency, so as to conduct an effective investigation. No case for anticipatory bail is made out.

Dismissed.

(RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK)
JUDGE

19.5.2015
AK Sharma