

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM No. M-43932 of 2016
Date of decision: 19.03.2018

Raj Gill

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA

Present: Mr. Rajesh Bhateja, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. S.S. Sandhu, AAG, Punjab.

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA, J.(ORAL)

This order shall dispose of instant petition filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. seeking concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.86, dated 30.07.2013, under Sections 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of IPC, registered at Police Station Phagwara City, District Kapurthala.

The instant petition had come up for preliminary hearing on 14.12.2016 and the following order was passed:

“Notice of motion returnable on 27.02.2017.

In the meanwhile, in the event of arrest, petitioner shall be released on ad-interim anticipatory bail in FIR No. 86 dated 30.07.2013, registered under Sections 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of Indian Penal Code, 1860, at Police Station Phagwara City, District Kapurthala, on furnishing of his bail bonds amounting to ₹10,000/- with one surety of like amount. Petitioner is directed to join the investigation as and when required and fully cooperate with the Investigating/Arresting Officer.”

Counsel for the petitioner concedes that petitioner has not joined

the investigation till date. He, however, claims that petitioner did not join investigation on account of health ailment/medical ailment. No documents have been placed on record to substantiate such stand.

In spite of this Court having granted ad-interim anticipatory bail in favour of the petitioner, 15 months back, petitioner has chosen not to join investigation, till date.

The conduct of the petitioner needs to be deprecated.

In these circumstances, petitioner is not entitled to grant of pre-arrest bail.

Petition stands dismissed.

March 19, 2018
Poonam (II)

(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE

i)	Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
ii)	Whether reportable?	Yes/No