

233

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

CRA-S-929-SB of 2016 (O&M)

Date of decision: February 22, 2017

Rattan Chand

.....Appellant

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

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

Present: Mr. L.S. Mann, Advocate for the appellant.

Mr. Abhishek Chautala, AAG Punjab.

A.B. CHAUDHARI, J (Oral)

CRM No.7641 of 2016

Heard.

Application is allowed for the reasons stated therein. Delay
of 767 days in filing the appeal, is condoned.

CRA-S-929-SB of 2016

Rule. Heard forthwith.

There is a challenge to the order dated 16.01.2014
imposing penalty of ₹50,000/- on the surety of the accused.

Learned counsel for the appellant has cited decision of
Supreme Court in the case of **Mohammed Kunju versus State of
Karnataka**, 1999(4) R.C.R. (Criminal) 726, in which according to
him, an amount of ₹25,000/- was reduced to ₹5,000/- by way of
penalty on the surety.

I have seen the said judgment.

The impugned order does not show any attribution to the appellant of having connived with the accused who fled away.

In the light of the above decision of the Supreme Court, the amount of penalty in the sum of ₹50,000/- is reduced to ₹10,000/- and the impugned order dated 16.01.2014 is modified accordingly.

Petition stands disposed of. The amount of ₹10,000/- as above shall be deposited within a period of 6 weeks from today, failing which this order shall come to an end.

(A.B. CHAUDHARI)
JUDGE

February 22, 2017
mahavir

Whether speaking/ reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No