

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

CRM-M-1269 of 2017

Date of Decision:15.03.2017

Baldev Singh and another

.....PETITIONERS

Vs.

State of Punjab

.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Mr.Nitin Rampal, Advocate for
Mr.Vivek Goel, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr.Sidakmeet Singh Sandhu, AAG, Punjab.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH J. (ORAL)

Though vide order dated 18.01.2017 it had been directed that the petitioners would join investigation and in the event of their arrest, they would be released on interim bail to the satisfaction of the Arresting/Investigating Officer, today learned State counsel, on instructions from the police official who is present in Court to assist him, submits that as a matter of fact, the petitioners had already been released on bail by the trial Court on 28.05.2015 and, thereafter, due to the petitioners not having appeared before the trial Court on one date, their bail bonds were ordered to be forfeited.

In the aforesaid circumstances, obviously the Investigating Officer has nothing to do with the matter any longer, with the 'challan' already having been presented and there being no averment by the State to the effect that any supplementary challan is being presented.

Consequently, the petitioners having jumped bail, I see no reason to entertain this petition which is dismissed. However, upon the petitioners appearing before the trial Court and applying for bail before that Court, if they

were indeed absent for only one date before that Court, the bail application would be decided on the same date.

If, however, the contention that they were absent only for one date is found to be incorrect, the aforesaid direction would not apply.

The petition stands dispose of accordingly.

**(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE**

15.03.2017

Anjal

Whether speaking/reasoned? Yes/No

Whether reportable? Yes/No