

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

207

CRM-M-16860-2022 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 24.11.2022

PALA RAM AND ANR

...Petitioners

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANR

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. Rajesh Duhan, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Pawan Kumar Jhanda, AAG Haryana.

Mr. Rakshit Gupta, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J.(Oral)

Through this petition, the petitioners seek anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.252 dated 25.03.2022, registered under Sections 120-B, 406, 420, 467, 468 and 471 IPC, at Police Station City Karnal, District Karnal.

On 25.04.2022, on an undertaking given by the learned counsel for the petitioners that the petitioners would pay the due amount to the complainant-Bank, within two months, the interim protection was granted to them and they were directed to join the investigation.

On 07.07.2022, learned State counsel had submitted that the petitioners have not joined the investigation and thus, the petitioners were again directed to join the investigation.

Today, learned State counsel on the instructions from the

concerned Investigating Officer submits that though the petitioner has joined the investigation, yet they have not paid the due amount to respondent No.2-Bank.

Learned counsel for respondent No.2 has raised a serious objection contending that the petitioners have not complied with the undertaking given by their counsel on 25.04.2022. Thereafter, again opportunities were granted to the petitioners to comply with the said order.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

Admittedly, the petitioner had availed, sufficient opportunities to make payment of the due amount, as was undertaken by them on 25.04.2022.

It may be noticed that the petitioners themselves have undertaken to pay the due amount. However, the fact remains that the petitioners despite having availed of sufficient opportunities, failed to pay the due amount and honour the directions passed by this Court. Thus, having admitted the liability and persuaded this Court to grant the relief of anticipatory bail to the petitioners, the petitioners are not expected to backtrack and any such action would be construed as an abuse of process of law and interference in the administration of justice.

In view of the above, this Court finds no justification to grant any further indulgence to the petitioners.

Dismissed.

24.11.2022

Aman Jain

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : *Yes/No*
Whether reportable : *Yes/No*