

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

Crl. Misc. No. M-46494-2016
DATE OF DECISION : 30.03.2017

Pankaj @ Pinki @ Geetali

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

Present: None for the petitioner.
 Mr. S.K. Yadav, DAG, Haryana.
 None for the complainant.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (Oral)

Though an adjournment slip has been filed on behalf of the counsel for the complainant, learned State counsel, on instructions submits that the petitioner is regularly joining investigation. He has filed an affidavit of the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Panipat, stating to the effect that the video footage of the CCTV camera clearly reveals that the petitioner is not seen taking away any household articles.

In view of the affidavit filed and the fact that the petitioner is regularly joining investigation, I see no reason why the concession of anticipatory bail should not be continued.

Consequently, the order dated 23.12.2016 is made absolute on the same terms and conditions.

Disposed of accordingly.

March 30, 2017
ndj/rajneesh

**(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes
No