

206

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.10278 of 2020

Date of Decision: 21.09.2021

RAVI GERA ALIAS KAIF

.....Petitioner

Vs

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

Present:None for the petitioner.

Mr. Bhupender Beniwal, Asstt. A.G., Punjab.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J. (Oral)

Petitioner seeks grant of anticipatory bail under Section 438 Cr.P.C. in case bearing FIR No.41 dated 18.04.2019 registered under Section 21 of the NDPS Act, 1985 at Police Station City-2 Abohar.

Learned State counsel on instructions from ASI Bhupinder Singh submits that the petitioner has neither appeared before the trial Court within a period of two weeks as directed by this Court vide order dated 10.03.2021, nor has deposited an amount of Rs.2,000/- towards cost(s) with DLSA concerned.

This was the position on the last date of hearing also i.e. on 12.07.2021. Petitioner has not produced any receipts qua the

deposit of cost(s) of Rs.2000/- with the DLSA concerned.

Notice of motion was issued on 12.03.2020 and petitioner was directed to appear before the trial Court within 15 days from that day. In the event of doing so, he was to be granted interim bail by the trial court subject to its satisfaction. The said order was however subject to deposit of an amount of Rs.2000/- towards cost(s) with the DLSA concerned.

Thereafter, CRM No.5680 of 2021 was filed for extension of time to comply with the directions dated 12.03.2020. This Court vide order 02.03.2021 issued notice in the application for 10.03.2021 and on 10.03.2021 this Court granted indulgence by allowing the petitioner to appear before the trial Court within two weeks and deposit the amount towards cost(s) with the DLSA concerned. In the event of his appearance and on deposit of the amount of cost(s) he was to be released on interim bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court. Thereafter on 12.07.2021, it was brought to the notice of the Court by learned State counsel that the needful has not been done by the petitioner.

Today also, learned State counsel has endorsed his earlier stand. There is no representation on behalf of the petitioner to admit or deny the contention of the learned State counsel.

Faced with the aforesaid situation this Court has no alternative but to dismiss the present petition for non-compliance of the order dated 12.03.2020 and subsequent order dated 10.03.2021 passed by this Court.

Petition stands dismissed.

September 21, 2021
Atik

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

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