

208-2

2023:PHHC:101970

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

CRM-M-31575-2022

Date of decision : 08.08.2023

HARJIT SINGH

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present : Mr. Ankur Malik, Advocate and
Mr. Zenim Dogra, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Shukla, AAG, Punjab

Mr. Lalit Singh, Advocate for the complainant.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (ORAL)

On 22.07.2022, the following order was passed :-

“Through the instant petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C., the petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.50 dated 05.07.2022, registered under Sections 384, 120-B IPC, at Police Station Khanauri, District Sangrur.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case; that as alleged, the meeting between Nazam Singh, Rajinder Singh and the complainant, was convened in the house of the petitioner; that there is no audio or video recording against the petitioner and that there is no allegation against the petitioner of taking money from the complainant.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of this Court, learned State accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. He submits that the audio and video recordings are yet to be authenticated and the voice samples of the accused persons are also yet to be taken. He prays for time.

Learned co unsel for the complainant submits that there is audio and video recordings of the conversations between the accused and the complainant.

Since the audio and video recordings are yet to be authenticated, the petitioner is directed to give voice samples to the Investigating Agency.

Adjourned to 01.09.2022.

The arrest of the petitioner shall remain stayed, till the receipt of the authentication report of the audio and video recordings.”

Today, counsel for the petitioner prays for withdrawal of the petition. However counsel for the complainant/respondent submits that after having obtained interim protection from this Court instead of joining investigation the petitioner has absconded abroad misusing the concession of bail granted by this Court.

Counsel for the petitioner does not dispute it and submits that even he has lost contact with petitioner.

Keeping in view the conduct of the petitioner, the present petition is dismissed with costs of Rs.50,000/-. The same be recovered from the property of the petitioner and be paid to the complainant/respondent.

August 08, 2023
Dpr

(Pankaj Jain)
Judge

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