

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

CRM-M No.2621 of 2020

Date of Decision:-29th June, 2021.

Ali Mohammed

.....Petitioner.

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent.

(Heard through Video-Conferencing)

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA

Present:- Mr. Imran Farooqi, Advocate
for the petitioner.

MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA, J.(Oral)

The petitioner herein has sought the relief of anticipatory bail in the criminal case as registered at Police Station City Barnala, District Barnala vide FIR No.373 dated 13.11.2017 under Sections 21 and 29 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985.

It is worthwhile to mention here that vide the order dated 21.01.2020, the petitioner had been granted the relief of interim bail subject to his furnishing personal and surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting/Investigating Officer and was directed to join in the investigation as and when called upon to do so and to abide by all the conditions as provided under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

Today, Ms. Samina Dhir, learned Deputy Advocate General, Punjab has joined the proceedings in this case and on instructions from

ASI Hardeep Singh of Police Station City Barnala, she submits that the petitioner has not joined in the investigation of this case despite the specific direction given to him by this Court in this regard vide the said order dated 21.01.2020, while extending the interim relief to him.

The above-said submission of learned State counsel makes it crystal clear that the petitioner has failed to comply with the aforementioned direction given to him at the time of granting the interim relief to him in this case.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has not been able to come forward with any fair, candid and plausible explanation for the violation of the said direction by the petitioner and that too, in the eventuality when the same was so given about one year and five months ago. This fact, in itself, does suffice to dis-entitle the petitioner for the relief, as claimed in this petition.

Keeping in view the above-discussed facts and circumstances, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner does not deserve the relief of anticipatory bail.

Resultantly, the instant petition stands dismissed.

June 29, 2021
Yag Dutt

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*

Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*