

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

CRM-M-22221-2020 (O&M)

Date of decision:23.11.2020

Varun Bahal

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Sudhir Kashyap, Advocate for
Mr. Gaurav Mohunta, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Bhupender Beniwal, A.A.G., Punjab.
Mr. Saurav Bhatia, Advocate for the complainant.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

Case is taken up for hearing through video conferencing.

CRM-28600-2020

Application is allowed as prayed for.

Annexure R-1 and R-2 are taken on record, subject to all just exceptions.

CRM-M-22221-2020

Through this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C., the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.116 dated 11.06.2020 registered under Sections 406 and 498-A IPC, at Police Station City Nawanshahr, District Shaheed Bhagat Singh Nagar.

Learned State counsel has drawn the attention of this Court to Annexure P-2, a copy of the application moved by Varun Bahal with the same set of allegations, which were raised by Satish Bahal. It is pointed out by learned State counsel that though the petitioner has joined the investigation yet he is not cooperating with the investigating agency.

Keeping in view the sequence of events, whereby the petitioner and his family members are making efforts to coerce the complainant, the petitioner does not deserve any concession of bail.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

In the present case, the petitioner was granted interim bail on 21.08.2020 by a Coordinate Bench of this Court. After the interim bail was granted to the petitioner, the brother of the petitioner, namely, Satish Bahal had moved an application before the Senior Superintendent of Police, Jalandhar (Rural) stating therein that the complainant Shweta had taken away the jewellery and committed a theft and placed on record the fake bills of jewellery.

In the order dated 21.08.2020, the contention of the the learned counsel for the petitioner, that he is ready to settle the dispute by paying Rs.7,00,000/- to the complainant, stands noticed. An undertaking was also given that the jewellery worth Rs.2,00,000/- lying with the petitioner, shall be deposited with the Investigating Officer. Even in the order passed on the last date of hearing i.e. 22.09.2020, the learned State counsel had stated that recovery of some other gold ornaments/items and cash was to be effected from the petitioner.

However, instead of complying with the directions contained in the aforesaid orders, the petitioner has started indulging himself into moving one or the other application/representation to the police authorities. This clearly shows that the petitioner has no intention to settle the dispute and is rather pursuing a different course of establishing a guilt on the part of the complainant.

In view of the above, no further indulgence is warranted.
Consequently, the present petition filed by the petitioner is hereby dismissed.

23.11.2020

ishwar

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?	Yes/No
Whether reportable?	Yes/No