

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

CRM-M-17042-2020.
Date of Decision:-18.08.2021.

Balpreet Singh @ Bunty

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Kanwaljeet Singh Brar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Saurav Khurana, DAG, Punjab.

(Through Video Conferencing)

VIKAS BAHL, J. (Oral)

This is a petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.193 dated 24.12.2019 under Sections 420, 120-B IPC, registered at Police Station Sherpur, District Sangrur.

On 30.06.2020, when the matter was taken up by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court, the following order was passed:-

“This is a petition filed under Section 438 of Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.193 dated 24.12.2019 registered under Sections 420 and 120-B of Indian Penal Code, 1860 registered at Police

Station Sherpur, District Sangrur, Punjab.

It is contended by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the complainant and the petitioner shared a very good relationship at one point of time which have now turned sour resulting in the filing of the present FIR. It is further contended that the FIR has been lodged after a gap of 27 months.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Pawan Sharda, Sr. DAG, Punjab has joined the session through video conferencing and accepts notice. On instructions from ASI Sukhpal Singh he has stated that the dispute in the present case relates to the fact that the petitioner is alleged to have taken an amount of Rs.2 lakhs from the complainant for getting his son a job in a company called SSUSKAA and in fact even issued an appointment letter, which was handed over to the complainant, which later on turned out to be fake. It is further contended by the learned State counsel that a cheque for an amount of Rs.1 lakh was issued by the wife of the petitioner, which later bounced. An amount of Rs.30,000/- has been paid by the wife of Gurcharan Singh, the co-accused in the case, which has been realised by the complainant.

The dispute seems to be regarding the payment of Rs.2 lakhs, which the petitioner is alleged to have taken from the complainant for providing a job to his son. Let an amount of Rs.2 lakhs be deposited by the petitioner with the Registrar General of this Court, to show his bonafides.

Meanwhile, the petitioner shall join the investigation and would come present as and when called for. However, in the event of arrest, the petitioner shall be released on interim bail on his furnishing adequate bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall also abide by all terms and conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973.

Adjourned to 10.07.2020.”

Thereafter, on 10.07.2020, learned counsel for the petitioner sought more time for compliance of the above order. Again on 21.07.2020, time was sought. Thereafter, on 06.08.2020, the matter was adjourned to 14.08.2020 and on 14.08.2020, adjournment was sought by learned counsel for the petitioner. Similar was the position on 21.08.2020. On 14.10.2020, nobody appeared for the petitioner and on 11.01.2021 also, none appeared for the petitioner and a request for adjournment through whatsapp was circulated.

Today again, in spite of the matter having been taken up twice, no one has appeared for the petitioner. Neither compliance of the order dated 30.06.2020 has been made till date nor the petitioner is present. Thus, the present petition is dismissed for non-prosecution and for non-compliance of the order dated 30.06.2020.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

August 18, 2021.

sandeep

Whether speaking/reasoned:-

Yes / No

Whether Reportable:-

Yes / No.