IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

103

CRM-M NO.17095 OF 2018
DATE OF DECISION: APRIL 25, 2018

Baljinder Singh @ Laddi

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH

Present: Ms. Satwant Mehta, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

*****

AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH, J. (ORAL)

It is the contention of learned counsel for the petitioner that on 23.10.2017, the petitioner had appeared before the Court, on which date, the case was adjourned to 28.10.2017 at the request of counsel for the petitioner. However, the counsel had noted down a wrong date and informed the petitioner the date as 28.02.2018. As per the information, which was given by counsel for the petitioner, he approached the counsel on the said date, when he was informed that the next date of hearing before the Court is 12.03.2018. On further enquiry, it was brought to the notice of the petitioner that non-bailable warrants have been issued against him on 28.10.2017, which was the actual date fixed before the trial Court and because of his absence, such an action has been taken. Subsequently, three dates were given by the trial Court and thereafter proceedings under Section 82 Cr.P.C. have been initiated and proclamation process has been ordered

Rakesh Khurmi
2018.04.25 16:45
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document

on 06.03.2018 (Annexure P-5) for 05.05.2018.

Counsel contends that absence on the part of the petitioner before the trial Court was neither intentional nor deliberate and rather he had been appearing on all dates, which were fixed by the trial Court after he was granted the benefit of bail. She also contends that the petitioner shall appear before the trial Court and will move an application for grant of regular bail, which may be considered and decided at an early date.

In the light of the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner, in case the petitioner surrenders before the trial Court on or before 05.05.2018 and moves an application for grant of regular bail, the same shall be considered and decided by the said Court keeping in view the assertions as have been put-forth by counsel for the petitioner and if the same are found to be correct, he shall be admitted to interim bail to its satisfaction.

With the above observations, the petition stands disposed of.

April 25, 2018 **(AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH)**
khurmi **JUDGE**

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

Rakesh Khurmi
2018.04.25 16:45
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document