



CRM-M-61893-2023

1

279

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-61893-2023
Date of Decision: 29.08.2024

KULDEEP SINGH ALIAS HONEY ALIAS KANTA

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE KIRTI SINGH

Present:- Mr. L.M.Gulati, Advocate
for the petitioner

Mr. Randhir Singh Thind, DAG, Punjab.

KIRTI SINGH, J.(Oral)

Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C., is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, in case FIR No.0215 dated 16.08.2023, under Section(s) 336, 160 of IPC and Sections 25 and 27 of Arms Act (offences under Sections 307, 148, 149 were added later on), registered at Police Station Jandiala, District Amritsar.

2. Vide order dated 21.03.2024, a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court granted interim bail to the petitioner and also directed him to join investigation with the police. However, on the subsequent date of hearing, i.e. 15.05.2024, learned State counsel submitted that petitioner did not join the investigation, in compliance of directions (supra) issued by this Court, whereupon, on request of petitioner's counsel, another opportunity was given to the petitioner to join the investigation. However, the situation did not change even on the subsequent date



CRM-M-61893-2023

2

of hearing too, inasmuch as, on 10.07.2024, learned State counsel again submitted that petitioner did not join the investigation, whereupon, as prayed for by his counsel, the petitioner was granted another opportunity to join the investigation. Thereafter, none appeared on behalf of the petitioner on the adjourned date and finally, the present case was fixed today for hearing.

3. Today also, learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Sarwan Singh of the concerned Police Station, submits that the petitioner has not complied with the directions repeatedly issued by this Court and he has not yet joined the investigation.

4. When this Court posed a specific query to the learned counsel for the petitioner as to whether the petitioner joined the investigation or not, the latter pleaded ignorance and submitted that he has no instructions.

5. The hereinabove discussed conduct of the petitioner impels this Court to draw an inference that the petitioner has no reverence for the orders passed by this Court, rather he sought opportunities time and again just to enjoy the relief of interim bail, whereas, he did not have any intent to join the investigation. Consequently, the instant petition is **dismissed**.

29.08.2024
Kavita

(KIRTI SINGH)
JUDGE

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