

Criminal Misc.-M No.40056 of 2019

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

Criminal Misc.-M No.40056 of 2019
Date of Decision: February 10, 2020

Gurtej Singh alias Baltej Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. D.P.S.Joora, Advocate for
Mr. Amandeep Chhabra, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

MANOJ BAJAJ, J.

This petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 438 Code of Criminal Procedure for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.45 dated 01.03.2019, under Sections 394, 420, 201 read with Section 34 IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959, registered at Police Station, Sadar Dabwali, District Sirsa. The petitioner apprehended his arrest at the hands of police, in the above FIR.

On 19.09.2019, the following order was passed:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that co-accused Jagjit Singh and Gurmit Singh have already been arrested, and from them recoveries have also been effected. The indictment of the petitioner, according to the learned counsel, is on the basis of disclosure suffered by co-accused. According to him, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner may not be required.

Notice of motion for 06.02.2020.

Criminal Misc.-M No.40056 of 2019

Meanwhile, the petitioner shall join the investigation and would come present as and when called for and in the event of arrest, the petitioner shall be admitted to interim bail on his furnishing personal and surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting/Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall also abide by the conditions as specified under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.”

On 06.02.2020, no one had appeared on behalf of the petitioner and, therefore, the case was adjourned to 07.02.2020. On the said date, again no one appeared on behalf of the petitioner and the State counsel had apprised the Court that the petitioner failed to join the investigation pursuant to the order dated 19.09.2019.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner states that the petitioner is not in touch with him.

Considering the above background and the conduct of the petitioner, this Court does not find it to be a fit case for grant of pre-arrest bail. Resultantly, the petition is dismissed.

February 10, 2020
ramesh

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No