

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

104

CRM-M-56895-2022 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 07.12.2022

MINTU @ BINTU

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. Manoj Tanwar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J.(Oral)

Through this second petition, the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.369, dated 26.08.2021, registered under Sections 147, 149, 323, 447 and 506 IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act, at Police Station City Mohindergarh, District Mohindergarh, the first one having been dismissed by this Court on 13.09.2022.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that though the petitioner was earlier granted the concession of anticipatory bail by this Court on 23.11.2021, yet the fact remains that the due to miscommunication, he was unable to join investigation and thus, the earlier anticipatory bail petition preferred by the petitioner was dismissed on 13.09.2022. He further submits that co-accused, namely, Raj Karan @ Pappu, has already been granted the concession of anticipatory bail by this Court on 16.05.2022.

I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner.

Conceded is the position that the petitioner did not comply with the conditions laid down in the earlier order dated 23.11.2021 passed by this Court, despite sufficient opportunities granted to him. The counsel for the petitioner could not explain the obdurate and disrespectful conduct of the petitioner. The anticipatory bail is a discretion which has to be exercised taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the case. In this case, the conduct of the petitioner takes away from him the entitlement of any such relief.

In view of the above, no ground is made out to grant the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Dismissed.

07.12.2022

Aman Jain

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : *Yes/No*
Whether reportable : *Yes/No*