

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

CRM-M No.39015 of 2022

Date of Decision: 30.09.2022

Naveen

.....Petitioner.

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent.

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

Present:- Mr. Sunil Chaudhary, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amrik Narwal, DAG, Haryana
for the respondent-State.

MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA, J.(Oral)

The petitioner herein seeks the relief of anticipatory bail in the criminal case arising out of the FIR bearing No.114 dated 22.05.2021 registered at Police Station Bhiwani Civil Lines, District Bhiwani, under Sections 120-B, 406, 420, 467, 468 and 471 IPC.

Learned State counsel has submitted the status-report (by way of the affidavit of the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Bhiwani), along-with Annexures R-1 to R-5 and the vernacular version of Annexure R-1, in the Court today and these documents are taken on the record.

A perusal of Annexure R-5, i.e the copy of the order dated 16.09.2022 passed by learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Bhiwani, reveals that the petitioner has been declared proclaimed person in the present case.

It has been held by the Apex Court in *State of Madhya Pradesh*

Versus Pradeep Sharma 2014(1) RCR (Criminal) 269 that “*if the accused is absconding and is declared proclaimed offender, he should not be granted the anticipatory bail.*” The present case squarely falls within the four corners of the afore-cited observations and in the light thereof, it is explicit that the petitioner does not deserve the relief, as prayed for, in this petition.

As a sequel to the fore-going discussion, it follows that the present petition deserves dismissal. Resultantly, the same stands dismissed accordingly.

September 30, 2022
Yag Dutt

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned:</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Whether Reportable:</i>	<i>No</i>