



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

220

**CRM-M-8504-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 29.04.2025**

OM PARKASH

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present : Mr. Vikas Bishnoi, Advocate for
Mr. S.K. Malik, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Surender Singh, A.A.G. Haryana.

SANJIV BERRY, J. (ORAL)

By way of present petition filed under Section 482 BNSS, petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR (Annexure P-1) as under:

FIR No.	Dated	Sections	Police Station
535	07.10.2022	420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC	City Fatehabad

2. It is *inter alia* contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the case. He contends that the petitioner has neither cheated nor defrauded the complainant in any manner, nor was he posted at the relevant post when the alleged transaction took place. He submits that the petitioner is ready to join investigation and has prayed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

3. *Per contra*, learned State counsel while referring to the status report filed by State prayed for dismissal of the petition on the ground that the petitioner has actively participated in the crime and even despite being



directed to join investigation by the Court vide order dated 14.02.2025, the petitioner has not joined the investigation despite taking another opportunity to do so vide order dated 11.03.2025, as such, the petitioner is not entitled to the concession of bail. Hence, prayed for dismissal of the bail petition.

4. After considering the rival contentions and perusing the record, it transpires that the petitioner was nominated in the present case on the allegation of having altered the particulars of chassis number and other details of the vehicle in lieu of taking illegal gratification. Admittedly, the petitioner was directed to join investigation vide order dated 14.02.2025, and subsequently, he was given another opportunity to join the investigation vide order dated 11.03.2025, however, the petitioner did not join the investigation in compliance to the orders passed by this Court.

5. Therefore, in the circumstances, without commenting on the merits of the case, since the petitioner has intentionally not complied with the directions given by this Court to join the investigation, no case is made out in favour of the petitioner for grant of bail, as a consequence, the petition is hereby dismissed.

6. Any observation made above shall not be construed as opinion of this Court on the merits of the case.

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

29.04.2025

S.Sharma(syr)

i)	Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
ii)	Whether reportable?	Yes/No