

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

CRM-M-28043-2019 (O&M)

Date of decision : 05.07.2019

Rajinder Pal Singh @ Rinku

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present: Mr. Naveen Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J. (ORAL)

It is unfortunate that in spite of the fact that such petitions for anticipatory bail have been held to be not maintainable, still the counsels are repeatedly filing the petitions. Members of the Bar are required to be vigilant and alive to the judgments passed by the Court.

On the oral request of learned counsel for the petitioner, this petition is treated as one under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

Counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner was granted bail in the year 2014. He regularly appeared before the Court, however, on 26.10.2018, petitioner could not come present. Application for exemption from appearance was filed which was allowed. However, counsel was directed to furnish surety within 7 days positively and the case was adjourned to 26.11.2018. On 26.11.2018, petitioner could not appear before

the Court as he was falsely implicated in another FIR. He further submits that after having been exonerated from the aforesaid subsequent FIR, petitioner filed application for grant of anticipatory bail which has been dismissed. He submits that petitioner wishes to appear before the trial Court on the next date of hearing i.e. 06.07.2019.

Keeping in view the averments made in the petition and contentions of counsel at the time of arguments, the present petition is disposed of with direction to the petitioner to appear before the trial Court and furnish fresh bail bonds with surety of like amount to the satisfaction of the trial Court. If the petitioner complies with the direction, he shall be released on regular bail.

05.07.2019

Pawan

**(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned:- Yes/No

Whether reportable:- Yes/No