

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

CRM-M No.4243 of 2020

Date of Decision:-29th June, 2021.

Sunil Kumar

.....Petitioner.

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent.

(Heard through Video-Conferencing)

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

Present:- Mr. Gurjot Singh Sadhrao, 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 Civil Lines, Sirsa vide FIR No.417 dated 02.12.2019 under Section 21 of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985.

It is worthwhile to mention here that vide the order dated 18.02.2020, 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 specified under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

Today, Mr. Surinder Kumar Dagar, learned Deputy Advocate General, Haryana has joined the proceedings in this case and on

instructions from ASI Vinod Kumar of Police Post Khairpur, Police Station Civil Lines, Sirsa, he 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 18.02.2020, 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 more than one year and four 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.

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

June 29, 2021
Yag Dutt

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*

Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*