

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Sr. No.202

CRM-M-28331-2019

Date of decision: 10.02.2022

Sanjay Paswan

....Petitioner

Versus

Ram Dayal Mehto and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL

Present: None for the petitioner.

None for respondent No.1.

Mr. Sumit Jain, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

* * *

DEEPAK SIBAL, J. (Oral)

The matter has been taken up through video conferencing.

None has appeared for the petitioner. The order sheets reveal that on 14.09.2021, 12.07.2021 and 26.07.2021 also there was no appearance on behalf of the petitioner.

There is also no appearance on behalf of respondent No.1.

Since the present petition, through which the petitioner seeks cancellation of respondent No.1's anticipatory bail, is pending before this Court for the last about 02 years and 09 months and has on earlier occasions been repeatedly adjourned due to non-appearance of the learned counsel for the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to adjourn the matter any longer.

Learned State counsel has been heard, who at the outset, submits that respondent No.1's anticipatory bail be not cancelled at this stage as his trial is virtually over since on the next date fixed before the Trial Court i.e. 23.02.2022 the defence has to lead its evidence and if no such evidence is led, then the matter is listed for final arguments.

In the light of the above and because the State acknowledges that throughout his trial respondent No.1 has not misused the concession of anticipatory bail so granted to him, this Court is of the opinion that the present petition must fail and it is so ordered.

Dismissed.

February 10, 2022
Jyoti 1

(DEEPAK SIBAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No