

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

CRM-M No.15990 of 2015 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 24.09.2015

Amandeep Gujral

..... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASWANT SINGH

Present: Mr. Manoj Tanwar, Advocate for
Ms. Adarshpal Kaur, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. K.S.Sidhu, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab
for respondent No.1/State along with ASI Surjeet Singh.

Mr. Arpandee Narula, Advocate for respondent Nos. 2 and 3.

JASWANT SINGH, J. (Oral)

The prayer is for grant of anticipatory bail to join the trial in a complaint case No.RT 36/01/02/2012 dated 02.07.2012, under Sections 406, 420 and 120-B of IPC, pending before learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Mohali.

This Court on 16.07.2015 has passed the following order:-

“ It is *inter alia* contended that in the complaint filed in February, 2012, address of the petitioner was given as IndusInd Bank SCO No. 23-24, Phase 3-B-2, SAS Nagar Mohali and at that time he was posted at Ludhiana. It is further contended that in July, 2012, the petitioner had left the job of said bank and joined in ICICI Bank at Pune. It is also contended that despite the reports that petitioner had left the job, no fresh address was supplied by the complainant. It is further contended that the petitioner was posted back to Chandigarh in December, 2014 only.

Notice of motion for 24.09.2015.

In the meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to appear before the trial Court on 28.07.2015 and on doing so, the trial Court shall admit him to bail on furnishing adequate bail bonds with two sureties in the like amount to the satisfaction of trial Court. Till 28.07.2015, arrest of the petitioner shall remain stayed.

In case, petitioner fails to do so, the concession granted to him by this order shall automatically stand vacated. ”

At the time of hearing, learned Counsel for the petitioner states that the petitioner has since joined the proceedings and is willing to face the trial.

Learned Counsel for the complainant states that on 10.02.2014, the petitioner was declared proclaimed offender and, therefore, his bail should not be confirmed as he is likely to abstain from the proceedings.

After hearing learned Counsel for the parties, this Court finds that the fact of the petitioner having been declared proclaimed offender on a previous date has been sufficiently explained and noticed in the order reproduced hereabove.

In view of the above, interim order dated 16.07.2015, passed by this Court, is made absolute.

Disposed of.

September 24, 2015

Gagan

**(JASWANT SINGH)
JUDGE**