

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

(202)

CRM-M-32233-2020

Date of decision: 17.08.2021

Sandeep

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL

Present:- Mr. J.P.Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Kuldeep Tiwari, Addl. Advocate General, Haryana.

...

SUVIR SEHGAL, J. (Oral)

The Court has been convened through video conferencing due to Covid-19 pandemic.

Instant petition has been filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 seeking anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 227 dated 23.08.2020 under Section 506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959 (Sections 148, 149, 285, 323 and 325 were added later on), registered at Police Station Nangal Chaudhri, District Mahendergarh, Haryana (Annexure P-1).

Vide order dated 27.11.2020, this Court granted interim protection to the petitioner and directed him to join the investigation and abide by the terms and conditions laid down under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C. Despite a lapse of more than eight months, the petitioner has not joined the investigation as has been informed by the State counsel upon instructions

from HC Ram Kumar. Even counsel for the petitioner submits that he has no instructions from the petitioner. Still further, perusal of the paper-book shows that the petitioner is involved in six other cases, the details of which are as under:-

- “(i) FIR No.320 dated 16.10.2019 u/s 25, 54, 59 A. Act, Police Station Nangal Chaudhary.*
- (ii) FIR No. 289 dated 28.10.2012 u/s 148, 149, 323, 506 Police Station Sadar Narnaul.*
- (iii) FIR No.308 dated 02.11.2014 u/s 147, 148, 323, 325, 341, 506 IPC, Police Station Nangal Chaudhary.*
- (iv) FIR No.273 dated 16.11.2016 u/s 323, 325, 341, 34 IPC, Police Station Nangal Chaudhary.*
- (v) FIR No.73 dated 21.03.2017 u/s 186, 332, 353, 506, 34 IPC, Police Station Nangal Chaudhary.*
- (vi) FIR No.367 dated 26.12.2015 u/s 147, 148, 149, 323, 427, 506 IPC, Police Station Nangal Chaudhary.”*

Discretionary relief of anticipatory bail is not meant for a person with dubious credentials.

In view of the above facts and circumstances, the petitioner is not entitled to the grant of anticipatory bail.

Petition is accordingly dismissed.

(SUVIR SEHGAL)
JUDGE

17.08.2021
Kamal

Whether Speaking/Reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No