

2023:PHHC:163976

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

207

CRM-M-46200-2023

Date of Decision : **December 20, 2023**

MANIL @ CHINTU

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present : Mr. Vivek Baghla, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Karunesh Kaushal, AAG, Punjab.
Mr. R.S.Bhatta, Advocate for the complainant.

KULDEEP TIWARI. J.(Oral)

1. This Court on 15.9.2023 passed the following order:-

“Notice of motion.

On advance service of copy of petition, learned State counsel appears and accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State of Punjab and seeks time to file a report and on advance knowledge of listing of the case, learned counsel for complainant also appears and accepts notice.

On a pointed query to learned counsel for the complainant to show any document, which would reflect that the petitioner was the person who facilitated the sale of car to him, he is unable to readily show the same.

Adjourned to 22.11.2023.

In the meanwhile, petitioner shall join investigation, as and when required by the Investigating Agency and subject to his reporting to the Investigating Officer within two weeks from today, no coercive steps qua arrest of the petitioner shall be taken. In case, his arrest is required to be caused, petitioner shall be

released on bail by the Arresting Officer till the next date of hearing on his furnishing personal bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting Officer. Petitioner shall also abide by all the conditions as envisaged under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.”

2. The petitioner did not join the investigation despite a specific direction passed by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order (supra).
3. On 22.10.2023, a status report was filed by the DSP concerned, wherein it was specifically informed to this Court that the petitioner has not joined the investigation, despite specific directions by this Court. Thereupon, last opportunity was granted to the petitioner to join the investigation.
4. Today, again the learned State counsel informs this Court that despite the petitioner was called thrice by the IO, on his mobile, the petitioner failed to join the investigation. It seems that the petitioner does not want to join the investigation and to comply with the order passed by this Court, therefore, the extra ordinary relief of anticipatory bail cannot be granted to him.
5. In view of the above fact, the instant anticipatory bail application is, hereby, dismissed.

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

December 20, 2023
ajay-1

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