

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

101

**CRM-14082-2019 in/and
CRM-M-18428-2019(O & M)
Date of Decision:02.05.2019**

SHANKAR SINGH

...PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

...RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Kulwinder Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

MANOJ BAJAJ, J.(ORAL)

CRM-14082-2019

For the reasons mentioned in the application, date of hearing in the main case i.e. CRM-M-18428-2019 is preponed from 22.05.2019 to today.

Application is allowed.

Main Case

Learned counsel for the petitioner has been heard.

According to him, the petitioner apprehends arrest in case FIR No.5 dated 22.01.2019 under Sections 61/1/14 of the Punjab Excise Act, registered at Police Station Bahawala, District Fazilka, wherein the vehicle from which 360 bottles of illicit liquor were recovered, belongs to him.

Para 3 of the petition reads as under:-

*“That the petitioner when came to know about the lodging of false FIR against him, moved first Bail Application before the Addl. Sessions Judge, Fazilka whose registered no was 201-2019 and Earlier vide order dated 16.2.2019 passed by this Court in BA No.201/2019, petitioner was admitted to interim bail and petitioner was directed to join the investigation, but he had not joined the investigation. Thereafter petitioner was granted two more opportunities to join the investigation, but he had not complied with the order of the Court so the bail application was dismissed. The petitioner had apprehension of arrest therefore petitioner could not join the investigation before investigation officer. Thereafter petitioner filed Second Anticipatory bail application which was also dismissed by the Addl. Sessions Judge Fazilka, on dated 28.3.2019. That Order dated 28.3.2019 is annexed as **Annexure P-2.** ”*

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that previously the concession of interim bail was extended on 16.02.2019 but the petitioner could not join investigation on the ground that he would be arrested. It is apparent that the petitioner has neither complied with the condition imposed by the trial Court while extending the concession of pre-arrest bail, therefore, no ground is made out for grant of anticipatory bail.

The petition is dismissed.

02.05.2019
sheetal

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No