

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH.

107

CRM-M-48411 of 2019

Date of decision:15.11.2019

Komal Jhangra

... Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH.

Present: Mr.S.R.Hooda, Advocate,  
for the petitioner

...

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (Oral)

The petitioner having been admitted to interim bail by the trial Court initially on 20.3.2019, with at that stage an offence punishable under Section 467 of the IPC not added to the FIR (at least qua the petitioner), subsequently with that offence having been added, she was admitted to interim anticipatory bail by that Court vide an order passed on 8.7.2019 (produced in Court today by learned counsel, though not on record).

Thereafter, on 22.7.2019 (again an order produced in Court today on the directions of this Court), it is recorded that an application was filed to the effect that the petitioner had gone to Assam and that she could not informed of the order, as there was a connectivity problem due to the floods.

Consequently, the petitioner was directed to join investigation within 3 days, with the interim order extended up till 29.7.2019.

On that date, the petitioner still not having joined investigation, her petition under Section 438 of the Cr.P.C. before that Court was

dismissed with the interim order vacated.

Mr.Hooda, learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that the said order was passed in the absence of counsel for the petitioner and that the petitioner could never be informed of the fact that she had been admitted to bail as regards the offence punishable under Section 467 of the IPC.

Having considered that matter, it is seen that she obviously knew that she was already on bail as regards the other offences and in any case she was required to join investigation as and when summoned.

Further, with an application also having been moved subsequently that she was away to Assam, obviously she was not joining investigation and was going all over the country; and her counsels' absence on the date that her petition was eventually dismissed (about 14 months after she had been admitted to interim bail), is only being used as an excuse to try and secure a bail order from this court.

Considering the aforesaid, I see no reason to entertain this petition, which is consequently dismissed.

15.11.2019  
pk/dinesh

**( AMOL RATTAN SINGH )**  
**JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned  
Whether Reportable

Yes  
No