

*IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB
AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH.*

Cr. Misc. M 25815 of 2016

Date of decision: 16.1.2017

Pawan Kumar Verma & ors

Petitioners

vs.

State of Punjab

Respondent

Present: Mr. Lokesh Sharma, Advocate.
Ms. Anu Pal, AAG, Punjab
Mr. LM Gulati, Advocate
Mr. PBS Goraya, Advocate.
Mr. GS Gopera, Advocate.

M.M.S.BEDI,J.

The petitioners had sought the concession of pre-arrest bail in 12 cases. For the reasons mentioned in the initial order dated 4.8.2016, a combined petition was entertained.

After hearing counsel for the parties, it is apparent that the petitioners have not complied with the interim directions of this court by joining the investigation or by sticking to the statement to refund the amount as per the orders of this court, to the victims. This petition deserves to be dismissed inter alia for the following reasons:-

- 1) Non maintainability of joint petition pertaining to the number of FIRs in different districts of Punjab.
- 2) Non compliance of the interim direction of this court to pay money to the victims.
- 3) Non joining of the investigation, as per the directions passed by this court.
- 4) The petitioners stand already arrested in other State in similar cases.

In view of the above said circumstances, this petition is dismissed. However, dismissal of this petition will not prejudice the rights of the petitioners to avail the alternative remedy by surrendering before the courts of competent jurisdiction and seeking the concession of regular bail.

However, it is observed that since the petitioners are involved in a number of cases in different districts of Punjab, the applications for regular bail, filed by the petitioners, would be decided within a period of 2/3 days by the respective courts. So far as the amount deposited before the Supreme Court and later on before this court is concerned, it will be open to the petitioners to seek any direction for the release of the said amount.

Nothing said in this order will prejudice the right of the victims to recover the amount from the petitioners, in accordance with law.

January 16 ,2017
TSM

(M.M.S.BEDI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/ reasoned

Yes/ No

Whether Reportable

Yes/ No