

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

CRM-M-40596-2019

Date of decision-21.12.2021

Sukhdev

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: None for the petitioner.

Mr. Luvinder Sofat, AAG, Punjab.

MANOJ BAJAJ, J. (Oral)

This petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 438 Code of Criminal Procedure for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.98 dated 24.07.2019 under Section 420 Indian Penal Code, 1860 registered at Police Station Nahianwala, District Bathinda. The petitioner apprehended his arrest at the hands of Police.

On 23.09.2019, the interim protection was granted to the petitioner and the said order reads as under:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner has relied upon the order dated 03.9.2019 passed by this Court in CRM-M-36922-2019, whereby coaccused of the petitioner has been granted concession of interim bail. He further contends that the complainant is related to the petitioner as his wife's niece is married to Sukhdev Singh (petitioner). He contends that the alleged amount was paid in the year 2017, whereas this FIR was lodged on 24.7.2019 on the allegations that amount was paid for procuring job for the grand-son of the complainant in Punjab Police.

*Notice of motion for 15.1.2020.
Meanwhile, the petitioner shall join the investigation and would come present as and when called for and in the event of arrest, the petitioner shall be admitted to interim bail on his furnishing personal and surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting/Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall also abide by the conditions as specified under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C. To be heard along with CRM-M-36922-2019.”*

Thereafter, the case was taken up on 15.01.2020 and more time was granted to the petitioner to join the investigation.

Learned State counsel on instructions from ASI Parkash has stated that despite calling the petitioner on various occasions to join the investigation, he has not joined the investigation.

Considering the above background and the conduct of the petitioner, this Court is of the opinion that as the petitioner has failed to comply with the order dated 23.09.2019, therefore, no case is made out for extending the extra ordinary concession of pre arrest bail.

Dismissed.

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

21.12.2021

vanita	Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes	No
	Whether Reportable :	Yes	No