

107

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

CRM-M-28968 of 2015

Date of decision: August 28, 2015

Satish Kumar and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SABINA

Present: Ms. Arti, Advocate
for the petitioners.

SABINA, J

Petitioners have filed this petition challenging the notice dated 08.07.2015.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that as per Section 111 of Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 ('Cr. P.C.' for short), while issuing notice under Section 110 Cr. P.C., petitioners were required to be informed in writing the substance of information received and the amount of bond, which was liable to be executed and the term for which, it was to be in force and the number, character and class of sureties, if any, required. However, the impugned notice was not in consonance with Section 111 Cr. P.C.

In the present case, vide notice dated 08.07.2015 (Annexure P-1), petitioners were directed to appear before the executive Magistrate on 20.07.2015. Along with the said notice, copy of the Kalandara under Section 110 Cr. P.C. was also attached, which specifies that the petitioners were not learning

from their mistakes and were involved in Maoists activities. Petitioners were liable to be summoned to execute a bond with the sureties of ₹10,000/- for his good behaviour for three years.

In pursuance to the notice (Annexure P-1), petitioners have already appeared before the executive Magistrate. Thus, in the present case, provisions of Section 111 Cr. P.C. have been substantially complied with.

No ground for interference by this Court, is made out.

Dismissed.

**(SABINA)
JUDGE**

August 28, 2015
mahavir