

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

Date of decision:25/05/2016.

Surender Singh

.....Petitioner

VS

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JASWANT SINGH

Present:- Mr.Aman Dhir,Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr.Kuldip Tiwari,Addl.AG Haryana assisted by
HC Santosh

Jaswant Singh,J(Oral)

Prayer is for grant of anticipatory bail on behalf of accused
petitioner-Surender Singh in case FIR No.172 dated 30.6.2015 under
Section 406 IPC,PS Chandimandir,Distt. Panchkula.

On 19.2.2016 the following order was passed:-

“Prayer is for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR
No.172 dated 30.6.2015 under Section 406 IPC,PS Chandimandir,Distt.
Panchkula.

Complainant-Rattan Lal alleges the Swift car bearing
registration No.HR-03R-0420 was taken by his friend-Surinder Singh
i.e. present petitioner-accused and who instead of returning it sold it off
to some third person for a sum of Rs.1.75 lacs.

By referring to bank statement- P2, it is contended that
actually the money towards purchase of the said car was paid by the
present petitioner-accused, however, it was got registered in the name
of complainant-Rattan Lal.

Notice of motion for 26.4.2016.

In the event of arrest, the petitioner shall be released on
bail on furnishing adequate bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of
the Arresting/Investigating Officer/Trial Court. Petitioner shall appear
before the I.O., as and when called upon for investigation and shall also

be bound by all the conditions stipulated in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.”

On the next date of hearing i.e. 26.4.2016 learned State counsel pointed out that petitioner was yet to join investigation and accordingly, petitioner was directed to present himself before the Investigation Officer/SHO concerned on 1.5.2016 at 10 am and as and when called.

Again on the next date of hearing i.e. 11.5.2016 the position remained the same and yet another opportunity was granted to the petitioner to join investigation on 15.5.2016.

At the time of hearing today, learned State counsel on instructions points out that petitioner has still not bothered to join investigation inspite of directions passed by this Court.

In response, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that his client was duly informed on all occasions of directions to appear and he has no explanation regarding his non-joining of investigation. He states that he has nothing more to say.

In view of the aforesaid conduct of the petitioner of not joining investigation, no case for anticipatory bail is made out.

Dismissed.

25.05.2016
joshi

(Jaswant Singh)
Judge