

Sr. No.103

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM No. M-9558 of 2017 (O&M)

Date of Decision:21.03.2017

Dharam Pal and others

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

... Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA

Present:- Mr. Bikram Chaudhary, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA, J.(ORAL)

The instant petition has been preferred under Section 438 Cr.P.C. seeking concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioners on the basis of averments that the FIR is likely to be lodged against the petitioners in a complaint bearing No.102 dated 13.02.2017 that has been moved by the complainant before the Economic Offence Branch, Police Station Sector 20 Panchkula.

Counsel for the petitioners has been heard at length and the case paper book has been perused.

There would be no quarrel with the proposition that registration of FIR is not a pre-condition insofar as entertaining a prayer as the one raised in the present petition. However, it was incumbent upon the petitioners to have demonstrated more than just an apprehension as regards false implication and arrest in pursuance to a complaint having been lodged.

Counsel would argue that the complainant is a close relative of a retired bureaucrat and thereby exercises influence.

These are vague assertions. The Court cannot proceed on the

strength of such assertions so as to insulate the petitioners by a blanket order of protection as regards arrest.

The matter is stated to be still under inquiry and investigation by the Economic Offences Wing/branch.

The present petition is held to be pre-mature and is disposed of accordingly.

21.03.2017

vandana

(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable	No