

CRM-M-19945-2022

Date of Decision: 24.05.2022

Nehchal Singh

.....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Parminder Singh Rai, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rana Harjasdeep Singh, D.A.G., Punjab.

Mr. Ritesh Pandey, Advocate,
for respondent no. 2.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (ORAL)

This is the second petition filed by the petitioner, seeking to be admitted to 'anticipatory bail' upon FIR No.22, dated 09.03.2020, having been registered at Police Station Sri Hargobindpur, Batala, alleging therein the commission of an offence punishable under the provisions of Section 420 of the IPC.

The first petition, i.e. CRM-M-10440-2021, was dismissed by this court on 20.12.2021, with the following order passed:-

“By this petition, the petitioner seeks the concession of 'pre-arrest bail', upon FIR No. 22 having been registered at Police Station Shri Hargobindpur, Police District Batala, on 09.03.2020, alleging therein the commission of an offence punishable under the provisions of Section 420 of the IPC.

Though as per the report of the Registry, even process fee was not filed, upon the complainant in the FIR having been ordered to be impleaded as a respondent in the petition; however, Mr. Ritesh Pandey, Advocate, appears for the complainant and submits that the petitioner has not paid anything at all to the complainant.

Learned counsel for the petitioner also fairly submits that no amount has been paid by the petitioner.

That being so, with notice of motion having been issued in this petition only in view of the contention made that the matter has been settled and an amount of Rs. 3,00,000/- would to be deposited, subject to which the arrest of the petitioner was to be stayed, I see no reason to continue with this petition, which is consequently dismissed, with the interim order dated 05.03.2021 vacated.”

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is willing to furnish a demand draft of Rs.3 lakhs in favour of the complainant, i.e. Gurnam Singh son of Savinder Singh, thereby ensuring that he would not back out from his commitment.

Adjourned to 19.05.2022, for the purpose of the demand draft being furnished.”

Thereafter, on 20.05.2022, learned counsel for the petitioner had sought 03 more days to furnish the bank draft for Rs. 3,00,000/- and consequently, hearing had been adjourned to 23.05.2022, i.e. yesterday.

Yesterday, the matter having come up after 04:00 p.m., counsel for the petitioner was not present and therefore hearing was adjourned till today.

Today, learned counsel submits that the petitioner has still not furnished the aforesaid bank draft.

That being so, this petition is dismissed.

May 24, 2022
nitin

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes
No.