

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

209

**CRM-M No.20941 of 2021
Date of Decision: 27.07.2022**

Deepak Kumar Attri

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

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

Present:- Mr. B.S. Tewatia, Advocate
 for the petitioner.

Mr. Apoorv Garg, DAG, Haryana
for the respondent-State.

....

MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA, J. (Oral)

Apprehending his arrest in the criminal case arising out of the FIR bearing No.81 dated 06.04.2021 registered at Police Station Sarai Khawaja, District Faridabad under Sections 420, 406, 506 & 120-B IPC, the petitioner has preferred this petition for seeking the relief of pre-arrest bail.

2. Bereft of unnecessary details, the allegations, as levelled by the complainant in the subject FIR, are that the petitioner, along-with his co-accused, hatched a conspiracy to sell a plot to her (complainant's) daughter for a sum of Rs.52 lac and he received an amount of Rs.6 lac as the earnest money but later-on, it was revealed that one Neeraj Kumar was the owner of the said plot.

3. It is worth-while to mention here that vide the order dated 26.05.2021 as passed by the Co-ordinate Bench, the petitioner was granted the relief of interim pre-arrest bail with the direction to join in the investigation and to abide by the conditions as laid down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C. As

mentioned in the order dated 02.09.2021, learned State counsel had apprised the Court that though the petitioner had joined in the investigation but he did not co-operate with the Investigating Agency and therefore, the petitioner was directed to re-join the investigation on 20.09.2021 and to co-operate in the same while further clarifying that in case of his failure to do so, the interim order passed on 26.05.2021 would be liable to be vacated.

4. Today, learned State counsel, on the instructions from ASI Mahavir from the afore-said Police Station, apprises the Court that the petitioner did not join in the investigation on 20.09.2021 or ever thereafter in compliance of the above-said order dated 02.09.2021.

5. To add to it, the petitioner is alleged to have received a sum of Rs.6 lac in connection with the alleged sale transaction and it being so, the possibility of the requirement of his (petitioner's) custodial interrogation for the recovery of the said amount, cannot be ruled out.

6. Keeping in view the afore-discussed facts and circumstances as well as the gravity of the offence as alleged to have been committed by the petitioner, this Court is of the considered opinion that he (petitioner) does not deserve the relief of pre-arrest bail. Resultantly, the petition in hand stands dismissed.

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

27.07.2022
neetu

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes*

Whether Reportable: *No*