

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA

AT CHANDIGARH

Criminal Misc. No.M-42442 of 2015 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 07.10.2016

Shweta Tyagi

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent(s)

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARI PAL VERMA

Present:- Mr. Tapan Kumar Yadav, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vishal Garg, Addl.A.G., Haryana.

HARI PAL VERMA, J. (Oral)

Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.257 dated 2.6.2014 under Sections 420, 406, 506, 120-B IPC registered at Police Station Civil Lines, Rohtak.

Vide order dated 24.12.2015, this Court had granted interim bail to the petitioner, subject to her furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the arresting/investigating officer and joining investigation, as and when called upon by the Investigating Officer and abide by the provisions of Sections 438(2) CrPC. However, the petitioner did not join the investigation. Accordingly, vide order dated 25.1.2016, the petitioner was once again directed to appear before the Investigating

Officer on 10.2.2016 at 11-00 A.M. Thereafter, on 26.7.2016, this Court passed the following order:

“Vide order dated 24.12.2015 this Court has granted interim bail to the petitioner subject to her furnishing personal bonds and surety to the satisfaction of Arresting/Investigating Officer. The petitioner was further directed to join the investigation as and when called upon to do so and abide by the conditions as provided under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

Learned State counsel on instructions from ASI Ram Niwas states that despite the order dated 24.12.2015 the petitioner has not come forward to join the investigation and, therefore, the interim order dated 24.12.2016 needs to be reviewed.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that as on date the petitioner is in Dubai and will return back to India within one month.

Accordingly, the case is adjourned to 19.9.2016 and the petitioner is directed to join the investigation and to appear before the Investigating Officer immediately on her return to India.”

Learned State counsel has submitted that despite there being repeated orders passed by this Court, the petitioner has not come forward to join investigation. He further states that there are two more cases of similar nature pending against the petitioner, one registered at Rohtak and another at Delhi.

Heard.

Despite repeated directions of this Court, the petitioner is not joining the investigation. It reflects the conduct of the petitioner. Therefore,

she is not entitled to the discretionary relief of anticipatory bail by this Court.

Accordingly, present petition is dismissed.

October 07, 2016
AK

(HARI PAL VERMA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking / reasoned?

Yes / No

Whether reportable?

Yes / No