

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH.

211

CRM-M-28144 of 2021

Date of decision:4.8.2021

Sandeep Kumar

... Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH.

Present: Mr.G.P.S.Bal, Advocate,
for the petitioner
Mr.Ramdeep Partap Singh, DAG, Punjab
Mr.Kamal Narula, Advocate,
for the complainant
...

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (Oral)

Case heard via video conferencing.

On 20.7.2021, the following order had been passed by this
court:-

“Case heard via video conferencing.

CRM-21121 of 2021

*The application is allowed. Filing of certified copy of
the order dated 9.7.2021 passed by learned Additional
Sessions Judge, Fazilka, is exempted, subject to all just
exceptions, and the same is ordered to be taken on record as
Annexure P-3 with the petition.*

CRM-M-28144 of 2021

*By this petition, the petitioner seeks the concession of
anticipatory bail, upon FIR no.104, dated 18.6.2021, having*

been registered at Police Station City, Fazilka, alleging therein the commission of an offence punishable under Section 420 of the IPC.

Notice of motion.

Mr.Amit Mehta, learned Sr.DAG, Punjab, accepts notice at the asking of the court.

Though otherwise I would actually see no reason to grant the petitioner the concession of anticipatory bail, however to determine the correct position as per the District Food and Supplies Officer, learned State counsel would get the affidavit filed of a gazetted officer from that department (other than of a gazetted officer in the police) before the next date of hearing.

Adjourned to 4.8.2021.

It is made clear that at this stage there is no interim order operating in favour of the petitioner.”

Pursuant thereto, a short reply by way of an affidavit of the District Controller, Food Civil Supplies and Consumer Affairs, Fazilka, dated 2.8.2021, has been filed which is ordered to be taken on record.

However, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner does not press this petition at this stage but further submits that in fact standard operating procedure for the Targeted Public Distribution System was not brought to the notice before the learned Sessions Court at the time when a similar petition was filed before that court and therefore the petitioner would file an another petition before that court placing on record

the standard operating procedure pursuant to which possibly the respondent-State of Punjab would file a reply with regard to the procedure having been adopted or not adopted; and thereafter bail would be granted or denied to him.

Since the petitioner is not pressing this petition himself, it is ordered to be dismissed as having been withdrawn, with no comment made whatsoever on the merits of the case by this court, in any case he not having been admitted to interim bail on the last date of hearing.

4.8.2021	(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
pk	JUDGE
Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No