

\$~50

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

**DECIDED ON : MAY 24, 2018**

+ **CRL.REV.P. 475/2018 & CrI.M.A.Nos.10156-57/2018**

PRABIR MUKHERJEE PROPRIETOR ..... Petitioner

Through : Ms.Anwesha Saha, Advocate.

versus

ORIENT BELL LTD ..... Respondent

Through : None.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.P.GARG**

**S.P.GARG, J. (Oral)**

1. Present revision petition has been preferred by the petitioner to challenge the legality and correctness of an order dated 17.02.2018 of learned Metropolitan Magistrate whereby the petitioner was directed to furnish solvency proof.

2. I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner. Relying upon an order dated 08.03.2018 in W.P.(C ) 10689/2017, the learned counsel for the petitioner urged that the impugned order cannot be sustained.

3. The petitioner was admitted to bail in the proceedings under Section 138 Negotiable Instruments Act. The bail bond furnished by the petitioner was accepted till the next date of hearing

i.e. 29.05.2018. The petitioner was directed to produce solvency proof. Apparently, the learned Metropolitan Magistrate was not satisfied with the soundness of the surety produced by the petitioner and had required him to furnish some proof regarding his soundness. No adverse order has been passed against the petitioner and rather the surety furnished by him was accepted till the next date of hearing. The impugned order cannot be faulted on that score.

4. Of course, the learned trial court shall consider the directions contained in W.P.(C) 10689/2017 at the time of acceptance of the surety bond.

5. The revision petition stands disposed of in the above terms.

6. All pending applications also stand disposed of.

**MAY 24, 2018 /sa**

**(S.P.GARG)  
JUDGE**