

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

CRM-M-20336-2015

Decided on : 23.07.2015

Ramesh Chander Handa

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NAVITA SINGH

Present : Mr. S.S. Behl, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. P.S. Grewal, DAG, Punjab
for respondent No.1.

Mr. R.S. Sidhu, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

NAVITA SINGH, J. (Oral)

Reply filed by respondent No.2 alongwith Vakalatnama
is taken on record.

This petition has been filed against the order dated 27.05.2015 vide which the request of the petitioner for permission to go to USA was declined. It was mentioned in the order that earlier the petitioner had misused the concession of bail and gone abroad without intimation to or permission of the Court.

Counsel for the petitioner submits that the daughter of the petitioner is residing in America and he needs to go there for her marriage. It is submitted that the marriage has not yet been settled with anyone. It is also submitted that on similar set of allegation, earlier the petitioner was discharged, but then the complainant filed a private complaint impleading the petitioner and

many other persons as accused.

A query was put to the counsel for the petitioner as to whether the summoning order was challenged, to which he replied that the petitioner did not feel necessity to challenge the order as he was comfortably with appearing in the Court and did not expect the matter to hang fire for so long.

Counsel for the petitioner further submits that wife of the petitioner is a Government Employee and his son is employed in a multi-national company and the petitioner has property in India and, therefore, there are no chances of his absconding.

However, on query, he replied that the other family members of the petitioner would also go to America and may follow him.

In view of the fact that the petitioner did not challenge the summoning order and that he earlier went abroad, his daughter is settled there, it is felt that the grant of permission to the petitioner to go abroad will not be in the interest of justice. There is every likelihood that he will not return from there.

At this stage, there is no ground for the petitioner to leave the country.

Dismissed.

JULY 23, 2015
Naveen

(NAVITA SINGH)
JUDGE