

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

CRM No.M-2928 of 2015 (O&M)

Date of decision: 28.01.2015

Sukhjit Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. Arun Takhi, Advocate for the petitioner.

Jitendra Chauhan, J. (Oral)

By filing the present petition under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the petitioner has sought anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No. 69 dated 14.07.2011, registered under Sections 457, 380 and 411 IPC, at Police Station Mahilpur, District Hoshiarpur.

Notice of motion.

At the asking of the Court, Ms. Harsimrat Rai, DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. A complete copy of the paper book has been handed over to the learned State counsel, in the Court.

The learned counsel contends that petitioner is a juvenile.

It is stated that some member of the bar advised the petitioner that he

being a juvenile need not to appear before the Court. The absence of the petitioner is not intentional and deliberate. He further refers to the compromise (Annexure P-2) and states that the compromise has been reached between the parties.

On the other hand, the learned State counsel opposes the bail application.

In view of the above, the petitioner is directed to appear/surrender before the trial Court, within three days from today and furnish bail bonds/surety bonds. In the event of his doing so, he shall be admitted to bail by the releasing Court during the pendency of trial, to its satisfaction.

Disposed of.

28.01.2015

sumit.k

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE