

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

Sr. No.: 207

**Criminal Miscellaneous No.M-46787 of 2021 (O&M)**

**Date of Decision: January 31, 2023**

Shantanu Ghosh

..... PETITIONER(S)

*VERSUS*

State of Punjab and another

..... RESPONDENT(S)

. . .

**CORAM:** HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

. . .

**PRESENT:** - Mr. Anuj Garg, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Kunal Vinayak, Assistant Advocate General Punjab.

Mr. Rishu Mahajan, Advocate for respondent No.2.

. . .

**Tribhuvan Dahiya, J (Oral)**

This is a petition for grant of pre arrest bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.70 dated 08.06.2021, under Sections 498-A, 406, 323, 506 IPC, registered at Police Station Women Cell, District Jalandhar.

Vide interim order dated 25.02.2022, the petitioner was directed to join the investigation and appear before the Investigating Agency as and when called upon to do so. It was also directed that he shall be admitted to interim bail on his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting/Investigating Officer, in the event of arrest. The petitioner did not join the investigation. The interim direction was ordered to continue vide order dated 13.07.2022, 15.09.2022 and 02.11.2022.

Subsequently, on 16.12.2022, this Court was informed by learned State counsel that the petitioner had not joined the investigation despite several opportunities. On 15.09.2022, the petitioner was granted last opportunity to join the investigation but despite that the needful has not been

done by the petitioner. Besides, petitioner's plea that only on account of threat of his life from the complainant and her family, he was not able to join the investigation, was also found to be false. As the police, after enquiry has filed a reply that there was no threat to the petitioner at the instance of his in-laws, in those circumstances, the interim protection granted to the petitioner was vacated by this court vide order dated 16.12.2022.

The situation remains the same even today. Learned counsel for the petitioner has only argued that only on account of threat from his in-laws family, the petitioner could not join the investigation, and therefore, he needs to be provided security.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Sukhdev Singh, states that there is no threat to the petitioner from his in-laws, and the matter has been enquired.

In view thereof, this petition stands dismissed.

Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stand disposed of as having been rendered infructuous.

(Tribhuvan Dahiya)  
Judge

January 31, 2023  
payal

<u>Whether Speaking/ Reasoned:</u>	<u>Yes/ No</u>
<u>Whether Reportable:</u>	<u>Yes/ No</u>