

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

Sr.No.202

**CRM-M No.43944 of 2020
Date of Decision: 17.11.2021**

Ranadeep Ghosal

...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 11.01.2021 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 within a period of one week and to continue to join in the same as and when called upon to do so and also to strictly 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 11.01.2021.

Reply filed on behalf of the respondent-State, by way of the affidavit of Assistant Commissioner of Police, DLF, Gurugram, is already available on the file and the same is taken on the record.

Learned State counsel points out that it has specifically been mentioned in para No.5 of the preliminary submissions in the said Reply that the petitioner has not joined in the investigation in the present case, despite the issuance of directions to him by the Court in this regard vide both the above-said orders and he was not found available at his residence on all the four (04) occasions as mentioned therein. Further, in para No.6 therein, it has categorically been deposed that besides the present case, the petitioner is also involved in ten (10) 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.

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

17.11.2021

neetu

Whether speaking/reasoned *Yes*

Whether Reportable *No*