

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

Sr.No.201

**CRM-M No.33749 of 2019
Date of Decision: 25.10.2021**

Amandeep Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA

Present: Ms. Ruchi Sekhri, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Samina Dhir, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab
for the respondent-State.

Mr. Kushagra Mahajan, Advocate
for the complainant.

* * * *

MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA, J.

The petitioner herein has sought the relief of anticipatory bail in the criminal case arising out of the FIR bearing No.100 dated 13.07.2019 as registered at Police Station Ranjit Avenue, Police Commissionerate Amritsar, under Sections 408 and 477-A IPC.

Vide the order dated 16.11.2019 as passed by the Co-ordinate Bench, the petitioner was granted the relief of interim bail with a direction to him to join the investigation and to strictly abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

Status- report filed on behalf of the respondent-State, by way of the affidavit of Assistant Commissioner of Police, North, Amritsar

.....

City, along-with Annexures R-1 to R-3, is already available on the file and these documents are taken on the record.

It is worth-while to mention here that in para No.4 of the status-report, it has categorically been deposed that though, the petitioner has joined in the investigation twice but he has not cooperated in the investigation and has not disclosed the actual facts and has also not got the embezzled amount recovered and in para No.5 therein, it has specifically been mentioned that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required to elicit the true facts and to take the investigation in respect of the said FIR to its logical conclusion.

Learned State counsel also reiterates the factum of the petitioner having not cooperated in the investigation of this case.

In view of the above-discussed contents of the status-report as well as the submission as made by learned State counsel, it becomes quite explicit that the petitioner does not deserve the relief of anticipatory bail. Resultantly, the petition in hand stands dismissed accordingly.

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

25.10.2021
neetu

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	<i>No</i>