

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

**CRM-M No.13124 of 2023
Date of Decision: 21.07.2023**

Charanjit Kaur @ Nimmo

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

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

Present:- Mr. Jaskirat Singh Dhaliwal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohinder Singh Joshi, Addl.AG, Punjab.

* * * *

MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA, J.(ORAL)

By way of the instant petition, the petitioner has sought the relief of anticipatory/pre-arrest bail in the criminal case arisen out of the FIR bearing No.14 dated 18.01.2021, registered at Police Station Sadar Fazilka, District Fazilka, under Sections 363, 366-A, 376, 120-B IPC, 1860 and Section 6 of the POSCO Act, 2012.

2. Learned State counsel has submitted the Status-report on behalf of the respondent-State (by way of the affidavit of the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub-Division Fazilka, District Fazilka) in the Court today and the same is taken on the record.

3. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel in the present petition and have also gone through the file carefully.

4. A bare perusal of the Status-report reveals that para No.6 therein, it has been mentioned that the petitioner has already been declared to be a proclaimed offender by the concerned Court on 31.05.2023.

5. It has categorically been observed by the Apex Court in **State of Madhya Pradesh vs. Pradeep Sharma (2014) 2 SCC 171** that “*where the accused was absconding and had been declared a proclaimed offender in terms of Section 82 Cr.P.C., he should not be granted anticipatory bail.*” These observations are fully applicable to the instant case and in the light thereof, it becomes quite explicit that the petitioner does not deserve the concession of anticipatory/pre-arrest bail. Resultantly, the petition in hand stands dismissed accordingly.

21st July, 2023
seema

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

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