

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

210

CRM-M-39689-2021
Date of Decision: 06.10.2021

Ravi

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present : Mr. Sawan Chaudhary, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Munish Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (ORAL)

On 23.09.2021, the following order had been passed by this
court:-

“Case heard by way of video conferencing.

By this petition, filed under the provisions of Section 438 of the Cr.P.C, the petitioner seeks the concession of anticipatory bail, upon FIR no.157, dated 17.06.2018, having been registered at Police Station City Narwana, District Jind, alleging therein the commission of offences punishable under Sections 379/420 of the IPC.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has only been arraigned as an accused on the basis of the fact that in the CCTV footage with the police, a vehicle was identified to be his.

Notice of motion, with Mr. Neeraj Poswal, learned AAG, Haryana, accepting notice on behalf of the respondent State, on the asking of the court. He submits that he would take instructions in that regard.

He further submits that in the order of the learned Sessions Judge rejecting a similar petition filed by the petitioner, it has been stated that the petitioner was

identified on the basis of CCTV footage.

He also submits that there are other criminal cases registered against the petitioner.

Adjourned to 06.10.2021.

A gazetted officer is directed to file a reply to the petition, specifically stating therein as to whether the petitioner was identified in the CCTV footage, himself, or whether any vehicle belonging to him was identified.

If there is any evidence connecting the petitioner to the crime, naturally that would also be stated in the affidavit to be filed.

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

Learned State counsel points to the fact, even as recorded in the order of the learned Sessions Judge, Jind, dated 15.09.2021, that the petitioner was declared to be a proclaimed offender on 06.08.2019 itself by the learned trial court.

That being so, without making any comment on the actual merits of the case, I see no reason to entertain this petition.

Consequently, this petition is dismissed.

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

06.10.2021
adhikari

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No