

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

CRM-M No.12528 of 2018

Date of decision : 30.10.2018

Sunil Bajaj and another

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE DAYA CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Sandeep Singh Ghangas, Advocate and
Mr. Gopal Soni, Advocate for
Mr. Akshay Jindal, Advocate for the petitioner.
Ms. Tanushree Gupta, DAG, Haryana.
Mr. Kamal Sharma, Advocate for the complainant.
Mr. Rajesh Bansal, Advocate for the victim.

* * *

DAYA CHAUDHARY, J. (Oral)

Learned State counsel submits that after getting the interim order in their favour, the present petitioners have involved themselves in another case *i.e.* FIR No.591 dated 24.09.2018 under Sections 120-B, 406, 420 IPC registered at Police Station Qila, Distt. Panipat and in that case anticipatory bail filed by petitioner No.1-accused Sunil Bajaj has been dismissed vide order dated 16.10.2018 passed in CRM-M No.45025 of 2018.

Meaning thereby, the interim bail has been misused by the petitioners. While on bail, they have committed the same offence. The relevant portion of that order dated 16.10.2018 is reproduced as under:-

“In the present case, petitioner has not pointed out any

serious infirmity or perversity in respect of rejection of his bail application by Additional Sessions Judge vide order dated 03.10.2018. Huge amount are involved in the present case and no recovery is effected so far. So, granting of anticipatory bail would affect the recovery of amount from the petitioner. Thus, petitioner has not made out a case for anticipatory bail.

Accordingly, present petition stands dismissed.”

Keeping in view the facts as mentioned above, there is no merit in the present petition and the same is hereby dismissed.

30.10.2018

sunil yadav

**(DAYA CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes / No

Whether reportable : Yes / No