



CRM-M-62546-2024

-1-

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**
101 CRM-M-62546-2024
Date of decision: 13th December, 2024

Sohan Lal

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Sumit S. Bairagi, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Arjun Lakhanpal, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL):-

This petition which is infact the second petition for grant of pre-arrest bail (though wrongly mentioned as first bail) has been filed by the petitioner in case arising out of FIR No. 158 dated 10.08.2023 registered under Sections 406 and 506 of IPC, 1860 at Police Station Jhansa, District Kurukshetra.

2. Brief facts of the case relevant for the purpose of disposal of this petition are that the aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of a complaint lodged by the complainant-Sanjeev Kumar making allegations that the accused Jai Kumar had purchased his Alto car bearing registration No. HR71J-4764 through the present petitioner and two more persons namely Lucky and Rakesh. He had assured to deposit the loan installments of the vehicle but failed to deposit the same subsequently and now the above named accused along with the petitioner had been extending threats to him. The petitioner had filed an application for anticipatory bail before the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Kurukshetra. He was directed to join



the investigation but despite availing a number of opportunities, he failed to do so. Due to which, the said application had been dismissed vide order dated 09.02.2024. Thereafter, he filed petition bearing CRM-M-9222-2024 before this Court and was given direction to join investigation vide order dated 22.02.2024. He failed to join the investigation even thereafter till 11.09.2024, due to which, the said petition had also been dismissed.

3. The instant petition has been filed by the petitioner making the same prayer and by submitting that he had made calls to the investigating officer and it was he who failed to join him in the investigation. It is also submitted that no recovery is to be effected from him. It is urged by his counsel that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. In view of the facts as discussed above, to the effect that the petitioner has failed to join the investigation in compliance of the order passed by this Court as well as the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Kurukshetra despite availing opportunities and further considering the fact that no extra ordinary or exceptional circumstance for grant of bail has been made out in favour of the petitioner and even present petition being second petition for grant of pre-arrest bail is not maintainable, I see no ground to allow the petition. Accordingly, the same is dismissed.

5. Since the main petition has been dismissed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

13th December, 2024
Parveen Sharma

1. Whether speaking/ reasoned	:	Yes / No
2. Whether reportable	:	Yes / No