

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

**CRM-M-2149-2017  
Date of decision-23.01.2017**

**Surjit Singh Bhullar  
Vs.  
State of Punjab**

**...Petitioner  
  
...Respondent**

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN**

Present: Mr. HPS Ishar, Advocate for the petitioner.

\*\*\*

**JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J. (Oral)**

This petition under Section 438 of the Criminal Procedure Code has been filed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in Complaint case No. 1644/12 dated 26.08.2012 registered under Section 174 of Railway Act at Police Station RPF Post Bathinda, District Bathinda.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that petitioner had been regularly appearing before the trial Court, however, he could not appear on a solitary date i.e. 08.07.2016. In fact the Court insisted on fresh jamabandi for the purpose of surety and as there was strike in the Suvidha Centre, the documents required to furnish surety could not be obtained, otherwise the petitioner had been regularly appearing before the trial Court since 2012. The absence of the petitioner from the process of the Court was neither intentional nor wilful.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and have gone through the case file.

Notice of motion.

At the asking of the Court, Ms. Harsimrat Rai, DAG, Punjab

accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. A complete copy of the paper book has been furnished to the learned counsel, in the Court.

In view of the above and considering the fact that the petitioner had been regularly appearing, it is ordered that in case the petitioner surrenders before the competent Court within one week from today, he be admitted to bail, on his furnishing adequate bail bonds/surety bonds, to its satisfaction.

Disposed of.

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)  
JUDGE

January 23, 2017  
vanita

|                             |     |    |
|-----------------------------|-----|----|
| Whether speaking/reasoned : | Yes | No |
| Whether Reportable :        | Yes | No |