

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

Date of Decision: March 20, 2017
CRM No.M-9437-2017 (O&M)

1)

Randeep Kumar @ Monu Pandit

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

2)

CRM No.M-9438-2017 (O&M)

Randeep Kumar @ Monu Pandit

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present:- Mr. K.P. Rana, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Amol Rattan Singh, J. (Oral)

By these two petitions, the petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail in respect of FIR No.81, dated 27.09.2015, registered for the alleged commission of offences punishable under Sections 25/54/59 of the Arms Act, at Police Station Rawalpindi, District Kapurthala and FIR No.76 dated 22.09.2015 registered under Sections 307, 226, 323, 324, 148, 149 and 120-B IPC and 25/27/54/59 of the Arms Act at the same police station.

The petitioner is stated to have been admitted to bail earlier, in both the cases.

However, the petitioner is stated to have remained absent on one occasion, due to infection in his upper respiratory tract and due to such absence, his bail bonds were forfeited.

In the aforesaid circumstances, these petitions are disposed of with a direction to the trial Court, that upon the petitioner appearing and filing an application under Section 439 Cr.P.C., it would be heard and considered on merits on the same day itself.

If the petitioners' contention to the above effect is found to be correct and he produces medical evidence before that Court to its satisfaction, he would be admitted to bail by that Court. If he is unable to satisfy that Court with regard to such medical condition as he contends that he was suffering from on the date that he had remained absent, the application would be disposed of on merits, whether on the same date or thereafter, as deemed fit by that Court.

March 20, 2017
vcgarg

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No