



203 **IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA**
 CHANDIGARH
 CRM-M-41365-2024 (O&M)
 Date of Decision: 24.09.2025

MONEY

...Petitioner

V/S

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL

Present: Mr. H.P.S. Bhinder, Advocate as Legal Aid Counsel
for the petitioner.

Mr. Hardeep Singh Wadhwa, DAG Punjab.

SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL J. (Oral)

1. Petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case arising out of FIR No. 74 dated 29.06.2024, registered under Sections 406, 498-A Indian Penal Code, Police Station Dera Baba Nanak, Police District Batala. This is his first petition for anticipatory bail.

2. The petition came up for hearing on 27.08.2024. Relevant portion of order dated 27.08.2024 is reproduced hereinbelow:

“xxxxxx

Adjourned to 27.11.2024.

In the meantime, the petitioner is directed to appear before the SHO/Investigating Officer to join investigation and in the event of his arrest, he shall be released on interim bail on his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of SHO/Investigating Agency subject to the following conditions as envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.:-

i) that the petitioner shall make himself available for interrogation before the Investigating Officer as and when required;



ii) that the petitioner shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him/her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;

iii) that the petitioner shall not leave the country, without prior permission of the Court and shall surrender his passport, if any.

Meanwhile, State counsel is directed to file an affidavit as to the exact role of the petitioner alongwith the details of pending FIRs, if any, on or before the next date of hearing.”

3. On 27.11.2024, when learned State counsel informed the Court that petitioner was not co-operating with the Investigating Agency, he was directed to rejoin investigation and co-operate with the Investigating Agency.

4. Again vide order dated 09.04.2025, he was given one more opportunity to join investigation.

5. Today, learned State counsel informs that pursuant to order dated 27.11.2024 and order dated 09.04.2025, petitioner has failed to rejoin investigation. He prays for dismissal of the petition for anticipatory bail.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner is at a loss to explain as to why and under what circumstances, the petitioner failed to rejoin investigation.

7. The benefit of anticipatory bail, which is an extraordinary relief,

cannot be extended to a litigant, who fails to comply with the orders of the Court. Since, petitioner has failed to rejoin investigation pursuant to order dated 27.11.2024 and 09.04.2025, interim relief granted to him vide order dated 27.08.2024 is vacated. The petition for anticipatory bail is hereby dismissed.

8. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be deemed to be expression of an opinion by this Court, on merits of the case.

24.09.2025 Ajay Goswami	(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)	
	JUDGE	
	Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
	Whether reportable	Yes/No