



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

CRM-M-57244-2024

Date of Decision:18.03.2025

Karun Kumar @ Karun Girdhar

...Petitioner

vs.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present: None for the petitioner.

Mr. I.P.S Sabharwal, DAG, Punjab.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 482 of B.N.S.S with a prayer to grant anticipatory bail to him in case FIR No.117, dated 07.09.2024, under Sections 420,120-B of IPC, registered at Police Station Model Town, Police Commissionerate Ludhiana, District Ludhiana (Annexure P-1).

2. Vide order dated 18.11.2024 passed by this Court, the petitioner was granted the concession of interim anticipatory bail and he was directed to join the investigation. However, he did not join the investigation in the present case. Consequently, again on 16.12.2024, the petitioner was directed to appear before the Investigating Officer at 10:00 AM on 20.01.2025 to join the investigation and was also directed to appear before the I.O on all other such dates, as and when required by the Investigating Officer and the case was adjourned to 17.02.2025.

3. On 17.02.2025, the case was again taken up and the following order was passed :-

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he has no instructions to argue the matter and he may be permitted to withdraw his Vakalatnama. Learned counsel for the petitioner is allowed to do so.

Vide orders dated 18.11.2024 and 16.12.2024 passed by this Court, the petitioner was directed to appear before the Investigating Officer to join the investigation. He was also directed to fully co-operate with the I.O.

During the course of arguments today, learned State counsel submits that the petitioner has not joined the investigation.

Consequently, the interim order dated 18.11.2024 passed by this Court is re-called.

4. Even today, during the course of arguments no learned counsel has appeared on behalf of the petitioner to assist the Court.

5. On the other hand learned State counsel on instructions from ASI Gurmeet Singh submits that despite repeated directions issued by this Court, the petitioner has not joined the investigation and no recovery could be effected from him. Learned State counsel further submits that eight more FIRs have also been registered against the present petitioner and he is a habitual offender. Out of eight FIRs, five FIRs have been registered only in the year 2025.

6. Thus, in view of the fact that the petitioner has not joined the investigation in the present case and in view of the fact that he is a habitual offender, the present petition deserves to be dismissed by this Court.

7. Ordered accordingly.

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)

JUDGE

18.03.2025

hitesh

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