

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-11639-2017(O&M)

Date of Decision: 23.03.2018

Amandeep Kumar

--Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

--Respondent

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

Present:- Mr. Sanjeev Manrai, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Madhur Goyal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. S.S. Sandhu, A.A.G., Punjab.

Mr. Pushpinder Sharma, Advocate for
Mr. B.S. Sidhu, Advocate for the complainant.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.J (Oral)

Instant petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C praying for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case F.I.R. No.25 dated 25.3.2016 under sections 420, 120-B I.P.C, registered at Police Station, Samalsar, District Moga.

Briefly noticed, FIR came to be registered on the allegations that the present petitioner as also some of his family members have collected money from the complainant on the pretext of getting a govt. job in the police department for the nephew of the complainant.

Learned State counsel apprises the Court that there are stated to be 22 other complaints raising similar allegations against Amandeep.

It has gone uncontroverted that against the backdrop of such serious allegations a Special Investigating Team (S.I.T) headed by Dy.S.P., Bagha Purana, District Moga, was constituted.

Order sheet would reveal that the instant petition came up for preliminary hearing on 7.4.2017 and petitioner was granted interim protection subject to his joining investigation.

The matter, thereafter, was taken up for hearing on different dates and Court was informed that petitioner has chosen not to join investigation.

On the last date of hearing i.e. 22.2.2018 an undertaking of the counsel for petitioner had been recorded that the petitioner would duly appear before the S.I.T on 8.3.2018 at 11 A.M.

Learned State counsel submits that petitioner has chosen not to appear before the S.I.T.

No rebuttal in this regard has come forth at the hands of counsel for petitioner.

Against the backdrop of the allegations and the conduct of the petitioner, this Court is of the considered view that the petitioner is not entitled to the concession of pre-arrest bail.

Petition is dismissed.

(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE

23.03.2018

lucky

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable:	Yes/No