

CRM-M-20257-2017

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

CRM-M-20257-2017

Date of Decision: 06.07.2017

Raj Gill

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr. Rajesh Bhateja, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

Petitioner-Raj Gill has filed this 3rd petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.212 dated 27.09.2014, registered at Police Station Sarabha Nagar, Ludhiana, under Sections 419, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and have gone through the record.

From the record, I find that first petition for anticipatory bail of the petitioner was got dismissed as withdrawn by his counsel. Then, he again filed petition for anticipatory bail which was also got dismissed as withdrawn by his counsel vide order dated 03.11.2015 passed in CRM-M-9910-2015. In the order dated 03.11.2015, this Court has held that on 28.04.2015, this Court had granted interim bail to the petitioner subject to

CRM-M-20257-2017

the condition that he will deposit the total outstanding amount along with interest within 15 days from that day. It was second petition for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and the same was entertained on the condition that the petitioner will clear the entire outstanding amount. However, the petitioner failed to clear the outstanding amount and, therefore, interim order dated 28.04.2015 came to an end. The order dated 03.11.2015 passed in CRM-M-9910-2015 shows that the petitioner has not complied with the interim order passed by this Court for depositing the amount. Now after more than 02 years, instead of surrendering before the police and joining the investigation, the petitioner has filed this third petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case and allegations in the FIR, I do not find it a fit case where the petitioner is entitled to the benefit of anticipatory bail.

Therefore, finding no merit in the present petition, the same is dismissed.

06.07.2017

parveen kumar

**(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE**

Note:	Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes
	Whether reportable	:	No