

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

CRM-M No.34562 of 2015

Date of Decision:-12.02.2016

Lalit Kumar.

.....Petitioner.

Versus

State of Punjab & Anr.

.....Respondents.

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASWANT SINGH

Present:- None for the Petitioner.

Mr. Kirat Singh Sidhu, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab
assisted by ASI Karamjit Singh.

Mr. Ramesh Sharma, Advocate for the complainant.

JASWANT SINGH, J (ORAL)

Prayer is under Section 438 Cr.PC for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner Lalit Kumar in case FIR No.110 dated 29.07.2014 for offences punishable under Sections 420 of Indian Penal Code registered with Police Station Bhawanigarh, District Sangrur.

On 07.12.2015 following order was passed:-

“ *Learned Counsel states that apart from the merits of the case the petitioner is very keen to settle this dispute with the complainant. On his oral request complainant-company i.e. Vinod Kumar Goel and Company, BKU, Balad Kalan*

through partner Prem Kumar son of Nihal Chand, resident of Hadra Marg, Sunam is impleaded as respondent no.2. Registry to make necessary correction in the memo of parties.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Ashish Sanghi, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent no.1-State.

Let respondent no.2 be served by way of dasti process. Dasti only.

Learned Counsel for the petitioner undertakes to supply a copy of the petition to the learned Deputy Advocate General, Punjab during the course of the day.

Adjourned to 22.01.2016.

In the meantime, in the event of arrest of the petitioner, shall be released on interim bail by the Investigating Officer to his satisfaction subject to the conditions envisaged under Section 438 (2) Cr.PC. ”

On the next date of hearing i.e. 27.01.2016 none appeared on behalf of the petitioner.

Same is the position today.

Learned State Counsel assisted by ASI Karamjit Singh submits that the petitioner has not joined investigation till today and in fact has been declared proclaimed offender on 22.12.2015.

Learned Counsel for the Complainant also submits that his client has not been contacted for any compromise.

In view of the aforesaid conduct of the petitioner and circumstances, it is evidence that petitioner-accused is not willing to abide by his initial stand, therefore, no further orders are required to be passed.

Dismissed.

**(JASWANT SINGH)
JUDGE**

February 12, 2016
Vinay