

CRM-M-18408 of 2015 (O&M)

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

CRM-M-18408 of 2015 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 30.11.2018

Varun Gupta

....Petitioner

Versus

Ajay Kumar Bansal and others

....Respondents

CRM-M-15792 of 2015

Sonu Bansal

....Petitioner

Versus

Ajay Kumar Bansal and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMENDRA JAIN

Present: Ms. Sunita Nambiar, Advocate,
for Mr. Balkar Singh, Advocate, for the petitioner
in CRM-M-18408 of 2015.

Mr. G.C. Shahpuri, Advocate, for the petitioner
in CRM-M-15792 of 2015.

Mr. R.S. Budhwar, Advocate, for respondent No.4.

RAMENDRA JAIN, J. (ORAL)

By this common order, I shall dispose of above-titled two

petitions filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing order dated

CRM-M-18408 of 2015 (O&M)

21.04.2015 of the revisional Court, whereby amount of ₹72,25,000/- has been ordered to be released in favour of respondent No.1 namely, Ajay Kumar Bansal on furnishing superdginama with one surety in the like amount in the sum equivalent to the aforesaid amount and also to execute and submit indemnity bond with one surety in the equivalent amount to the satisfaction of the revisional Court.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submit that application of respondent No.1 for staying the release of said amount on superdari was declined by the trial Court. However, the revisional Court has wrongly and illegally vide impugned order has released the said amount to respondent No.1.

Learned counsel for respondent No.4 pleaded the legality and validity of the impugned order.

Having given thoughtful consideration to the rival submissions of learned counsel for the parties, this Court finds both petitions completely devoid of any merit for the reason that aforesaid amount of ₹72,25,000/- has been released to respondent No.1 against adequate security with one surety of the like amount by the revisional Court vide impugned order. Same is perfectly legal order requiring no interference inasmuch as huge currency, by this time, could not have been kept in the police custody for such a long period, more particularly on account of demonetisation, where there is no safe arrangement to retain such a valuable item.

Moreso, rights of the rightful claimant have been protected by the revisional Court by asking respondent No.1 to furnish

CRM-M-18408 of 2015 (O&M)

superdginama and indemnity bond with surety of the like amount each.

Dismissed.

November 30, 2018
R.S.

(Ramendra Jain)
Judge

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