

CRM-M-24502-2016

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

CRM-M-24502-2016 (O & M)

Date of Decision: 04.10.2017

Shalu

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGH

Present: Mr. Ashok Saini, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. B.S.Virk, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Vinod Arya, Advocate,
for the complainant.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

CRM-28212-2017

Allowed as prayed for. Annexure P-5 (Colly.) is taken on record.

CRM-M-24502-2016

Petitioner-Shalu has filed this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.884 dated 18.10.2013, registered at Police Station Civil Lines, Karnal under Sections 406, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 505 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code.

Notice of motion was issued in this case. Learned State counsel has put in appearance on behalf of the respondent-State and complainant has also appeared through his counsel. They contested this petition.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties as well as learned State counsel and have gone through the record.

CRM-M-24502-2016

From the record, I find that this Court passed the interim order on 22.02.2017 asking the petitioner to appear before the trial Court and in the event of her appearance, trial Court was directed to admit her on *interim bail* on furnishing requisite bail bonds/surety bonds subject to its satisfaction and the case was adjourned to 17.04.2017. It is also mentioned in the order dated 22.02.2017 that learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the provisions in terms of Section 82 Cr.P.C. have not been followed while declaring the petitioner to be a proclaimed person. On the next date i.e. 17.04.2017, none appeared on behalf of the petitioner whereas learned State counsel brought into notice of this Court that the petitioner did not cause her appearance before the trial court. Thereafter, neither the petitioner appeared before the trial Court to comply with the order of this Court, nor any application was filed for extending the time for surrender. Perusal of the record shows that the petitioner has already been declared proclaimed offender and petition for quashing of order declaring her as proclaimed offender is also pending. The petitioner has not complied with the interim direction issued by this Court. No ground is made out to grant her the benefit of anticipatory bail in the facts and circumstances of the present case.

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

04.10.2017

parveen kumar

**(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE**

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