

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-40402-2018 (O&M)
Date of Decision:-14.09.2018.

Rajat Verma

.....Petitioner

Versus

Sanjeev Mittal and another

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P.B. BAJANTHRI

Present: Mr. Siddharth Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.

P.B. BAJANTHRI, J. (Oral)

In this petition, petitioner has sought for anticipatory bail in case Complaint No.COMA-949 of 2017 titled as “Sanjeev Mittal Vs. Rajat Verma and another” registered on 17.04.2017 (Annexure P-1) under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881.

- 2.) Heard the matter.
- 3.) Perusal of the order dated 02.08.2018 relating to consideration of petitioner's bail application, petitioner has not made out a case.
- 4.) Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that petitioner is permanent resident of Uttar Pradesh. He is not in a position to comply the conditions imposed in the bail order dated 02.11.2017. The aforesaid contention cannot be appreciated at this point of time. Petitioner could have sought for necessary clarification or amendment of the order dated 02.11.2017 to the extent of relaxation of conditions imposed in the bail

order. Moreover, he can apprise the Court about condition if he has no sound surety. Once he flouted the order of the Court, in that event, he is not entitled for the relief of anticipatory bail.

5.) Accordingly, petition stands dismissed. Reserving liberty to the petitioner to surrender before the Trial Court and make necessary application for fresh bail.

(P.B. BAJANTHRI)
JUDGE

September 14, 2018.
sandeep

Whether speaking/reasoned:-

Yes / No

Whether Reportable:-

Yes / No.