

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

**CRL. MISC. No.M-32789 OF 2016 (O&M)
DATE OF DECISION : 23rd SEPTEMBER, 2016**

Varun Kumar

.... Petitioner

Versus

U. T. Chandigarh

.... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A. B. CHAUDHARI

* * * *

Present : Mr. G. S. Sandhu, Advocate for the petitioner.

* * * *

A. B. CHAUDHARI, J. (ORAL)

CRM-29640-2016

The application is allowed and Annexure P-3 is taken on record subject to all just exceptions.

CRL. MISC. No.M-32789 OF 2016

Rule heard forthwith.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner.

It is not necessary to issue notice to the respondent in view of short controversy involved.

Perused the order granting bail to the petitioner and impugned order dated 09.09.2016. The petitioner was absent on 09.09.2016 when the case was called out for hearing. In that view of the matter, the trial Court issued non-bailable warrants by cancelling the bail bonds of the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the petitioner, upon instructions, makes categorical statement that hereinafter the petitioner would appear before the trial court rather than asking for exemption for personal appearance and would continue to appear thereafter with promptitude till the trial is completed.

In that view of the matter, in order to give one chance to the petitioner the impugned order dated 09.09.2016 is set aside and the petitioner shall continue to remain on bail on the original bonds.

It is made clear that this order is made on the undertaking given by counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner would appear before the trial court with promptitude.

Disposed of accordingly.

23rd SEPTEMBER, 2016
‘raj’

(A. B. CHAUDHARI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes	No
Whether Reportable:	Yes	No.