

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

**CRM-M No. 14349 of 2023
Date of Decision: 06.09.2023**

Mukhtar Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

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

Present:- Mr. Rahul Kumar Adia, Advocate
 for the petitioner.

Mr. Gurlal Singh Dhillon, AAG, Punjab.

MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA, J.(Oral)

By way of this petition, the petitioner has made the 2nd attempt to seek the relief of anticipatory/pre-arrest bail in the criminal case arisen out of the FIR bearing No.36 dated 23.06.2019 registered at Police Station Sarai Amant Khan, District Tarn Taran, under Sections 323, 324, 506, 148 and 149 IPC (wherein the offences under Sections 325 & 326 IPC are stated to have been added later-on).

2. It is pertinent to mention here that vide order Annexure P-2 passed by this Court on 15.09.2022, the petition having **CRM-M No.22953 of 2022**, as moved by the petitioner earlier for seeking the same relief, had been dismissed, while observing that after having been extended the relief of interim anticipatory bail vide the order passed by the Co-ordinate Bench

on 06.06.2022, though he (petitioner) had, initially, joined the investigation but had not co-operated with the investigating agency and thereafter, he had not joined in the investigation, despite the issuance of direction to him by this Court for the said purpose.

3. Status-Report has already been submitted on behalf of the respondent-State, by way of the affidavit of the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub Division Tarn Taran, District Tarn Taran.

4. 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.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner deserves to be afforded one more opportunity to join in the investigation and to be granted the concession of anticipatory bail because due to some unavoidable circumstances, he could not comply with the directions, issued by this Court earlier, in the afore-referred previously filed bail petition.

6. However, learned State counsel argues that in view the above-mentioned conduct of the petitioner, this petition be dismissed.

7. From the afore-narrated facts and circumstances, it becomes explicit that the bail petition preferred by the petitioner earlier, had been dismissed due to his having not co-operated with the investigating agency and also for his having not complied with the direction given by this Court subsequently, to re-join in the investigation. Keeping in view the above-discussed conduct on his part, coupled with the fact that it has specifically been deposed in para No.7 in the Status-Report that the proceedings have

already been initiated against him under Sections 82/83 Cr.P.C to declare him proclaimed person/offender, this Court is of the considered opinion that he (petitioner) does not deserve the relief of anticipatory/pre-arrest bail. Resultantly, the petition in hand stands dismissed accordingly.

September 06, 2023
pooja

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

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