

S. No.220

2024:PHHC:049308

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-15770 of 2024

Date of Decision:10.04.2024

Anita Kumari

.....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK GUPTA

Present:- None for the petitioner.
Mr. Baljinder Singh, DAG, Punjab.
Mr. Amit Dhawan, Advocate for the complainant.

DEEPAK GUPTA, J. (Oral)

On the previous date of hearing i.e. 27.03.2024, following order was
passed by this Court:-

“Prayer in this second petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. is for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.174 dated 11.08.2023, under Sections 419, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B IPC, registered at Police Station Navi Baradari, District Jalandhar.

First petition bearing No. CRM-M-61452-2023 was dismissed as withdrawn by this Court vide order dated 08.01.2024 by passing following order:

“After arguing the case at length, when this Court was not inclined to grant any benefit of anticipatory bail, statement is made by learned counsel for the petitioner so as to withdraw the present petition.

In view of the statement made by learned counsel for the petitioner, the present petition is dismissed as withdrawn.”

Learned counsel has tried to contend that there is change in circumstance.

Notice of motion.

Mr. G.P.S. Bhullar, AAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State.

Adjourned to 10.04.2024.

Respondent-State is hereby directed to justify its conduct why the petitioner has not been arrested till date despite dismissal of the earlier petition seeking anticipatory bail by this Court vide order dated 08.01.2024.”

Today, short reply by way of an affidavit of Shri Nimal Singh, PPS, Assistant Commissioner of Police (Central), Police Commissionerate, Jalandhar has been filed on behalf of the respondent- State as per which despite repeated raids being conducted at the place of petitioner, he is concealing himself.

Power of Attorney has also been filed on behalf of the complainant.

A written request for adjournment is received on behalf of the counsel for the petitioner on the ground that he is out of station due to personal difficulty.

Having regard to the observations made by this Court in its order dated 27.03.2024, this Court does not find any ground so as to adjourn the matter.

Dismissed in default for want of prosecution.

April 10, 2024
renu

(DEEPAK GUPTA)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No