

232

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

CRA-S-3870-SB-2013 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 11.04.2016

PINNI RAM

..... Petitioner

VS.

STATE OF UT CHANDIGARH

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH.

Present: Mr. Ajay Saini, Advocate,
for the appellant.

[
Mr. Neeraj, Advocate,
for Mr. A.S. Virk, APP
for U.T., Chandigarh

1. *Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers may be allowed to see the judgment?*
2. *To be referred to the Reporters or not?*
3. *Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?*

KULDIP SINGH, J (ORAL)

Learned counsel for the appellant contended that the petitioner-Pinni Ram has stood as a surety for one Ajay Kumar who was accused for the offence under Section 20 of NDPS Act, 1985. Accused Ajay Kumar absented and warrants of his arrest were issued and ultimately proclamation was issued. Notice to the present application, under Section 446 Cr. P.C. was also issued and vide orders dated 05.06.2012 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Chandigarh, penalty of Rs. 50,000/- was imposed. Further, the learned counsel for the appellant also pointed out towards the order dated 07.07.2012 which shows that after the proclamation, accused Ajay Kumar had voluntarily

appeared before the Court, before declaring him a proclaimed offender. He was taken into custody and subsequently he faced the trial.

Keeping in view the fact that the accused had subsequently appeared, learned counsel for the appellant prays for reduction in amount of the penalty.

Accordingly, the penalty Rs. 50,000/- is hereby reduced to Rs. 20,000/-.

With this modification, the present appeal is stands dismissed.

**[KULDIP SINGH]
JUDGE**

April 11, 2016
Suresh Kumar