

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM No.M-3035 of 2016

Date of decision: March 29, 2016.

Paramjit Singh

... **Petitioner**

v.

State of Punjab and another

... **Respondents**

CORAM: **HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH**

Present: Mr. Ashish Aggarwal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. APS Gill, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab

Mr. Pardeep Rajput, Advocate for respondent No.2.

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

Kuldip Singh, J. (Oral):

Case of the petitioner has been considered. It comes out that the petitioner was convicted under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 by learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, Amritsar. The petitioner preferred an appeal against the said judgment. Learned Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar while granting bail to the petitioner on furnishing bail bonds in the sum of Rs.50,000/- with one surety in the like amount within 20 days, imposed a condition that the petitioner shall deposit a sum of Rs.1 lac in the trial court. It is this condition which has been contested before this Court.

I am of the view that once the appeal has been admitted for hearing and the accused was enlarged on bail, the condition of depositing Rs.1 lac before the trial court is unjustified and amounts to partially pre-

judging the said case. Therefore, the said condition of depositing Rs.1 lac before the trial court is set aside. The petition is accordingly allowed.

March 29, 2016.
kadyan

[Kuldip Singh]
Judge