

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Sr.No.201

CRM-M No.5137 of 2021

Date of Decision: 26th July, 2021.

Harjasnit Singh @ Hampreet Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

(Heard through Video-Conferencing)

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

Present: Mr. P.K.S. Phoolka, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Samina Dhir, DAG, Punjab.

* * * *

MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA, J. (ORAL)

Apprehending his arrest in the criminal case arising out of the FIR bearing No.767 dated 21.10.2020 registered at Police Station Anti Power Theft, Bathinda, under Section 135 of the Electricity Act, 2003, the petitioner has preferred this petition for seeking the relief of anticipatory bail.

It is worthwhile to mention here that vide the order dated 06.04.2021, the petitioner had been granted the relief of interim bail subject to his depositing a sum of Rs.03 (three) lacs within two weeks and joining in the investigation as and when called upon to do so and abiding by other conditions as provided under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

However, learned State counsel, on the instructions from HC Amarjeet Singh, Police Station Anti Power Theft, Bathinda, submits that the petitioner has neither deposited the amount of Rs.3

lacs within the stipulated period of two weeks from 06.04.2021 nor he has joined in the investigation of this case despite the specific directions given to him by this Court vide the said order dated 06.04.2021, while extending the interim relief to him. In view of this submission, it becomes crystal clear that the petitioner has failed to comply with the afore-said directions.

Though, learned counsel for the petitioner seeks some more time for compliance of the said directions by the petitioner but however, the fact remains that he has not been able to advance any fair, candid and plausible explanation for the non-compliance/ violation of the said directions by the petitioner and that too, in the eventuality when the same were so given more than 3 ½ 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 accordingly.

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

26.07.2021.
seema

Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
Whether Reportable?	Yes/No