

CRM-M-54808 of 2021
Date of Decision: 10.01.2022

Naresh Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Baljeet Beniwal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajat Gautam, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Loveneet Thakur, Advocate for the complainant.

(Through Video Conferencing)

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.(ORAL)

Learned State counsel on instructions received from ASI Charan Singh submits that the petitioner has come to the concerned police station in compliance of the order dated 03.01.2022 and they want custodial investigation and hence, he opposed the bail. Learned State counsel has also argued that the original SPA is yet to be recovered.

Learned counsel for the petitioner on instructions submits that probably the original SPA has been destroyed. He has referred to the judgment in paragraph 7 of the petition which is distinguishable. He also submits that the petitioner is a victim as he has been falsely implicated and has not been named in the FIR and he has clean antecedents. The learned counsel for petitioner has further placed reliance on the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Md. Ibrahim & others. v. State of Bihar & another**, (2009) 8 SCC 751 to support his arguments.

This court finds no merit in the arguments of learned counsel for the petitioner. Petitioner has failed to make out a case for anticipatory bail. The interim protection order dated 03.01.2022 is hereby recalled. Consequently, the present petition is dismissed.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE**January 10, 2022**

Manpreet

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes
Whether reportable	:	No