

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

Sr.No.202-A

**CRM-M No.43890 of 2020
Date of Decision: 17.11.2021**

Ashima Malhotra

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

(Heard through Video-Conferencing)

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

Present: Mr. Vishwendra Verma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Apoorv Garg, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana
for the respondent-State.

* * * *

MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner herein has sought the relief of anticipatory bail in the criminal case arising out of the FIR bearing No.132 dated 24.03.2020 registered at Police Station DLF, District Gurugram, under Sections 406, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC.

It is worth-while to mention here that vide the order dated 19.02.2021 as passed by the Co-ordinate Bench, the petitioner had been extended the relief of interim bail with the direction to join in the investigation on 10.03.2021 and to continue to join in the same as and when called upon to do so and also to abide by the conditions as laid down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

On 20.08.2021, learned State counsel had informed that the

.....

petitioner had not joined in the investigation in compliance of the above-said order. Then, on the request of learned counsel for the petitioner, one more opportunity was afforded to the petitioner to comply with the said order dated 19.02.2021.

Today, learned State counsel, on the instructions from ASI Satish, Police Station DLF, Gurugram, again apprises the Court that the petitioner has not joined in the investigation despite the issuance of the directions to her by the Court in this regard, vide both the above-said orders. Moreover, it has specifically been mentioned in para No.4 of the preliminary submissions in the Reply as already filed on behalf of the respondent-State, that besides the present case, the petitioner is also involved in nine (09) more criminal cases as detailed therein.

Keeping in view the above-discussed facts and circumstances, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner does not deserve the relief of anticipatory bail. Resultantly, the petition in hand stands dismissed accordingly.

17.11.2021

neetu

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

*Whether speaking/reasoned**Yes**Whether Reportable**No*