

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

**CRA-S-829-SB of 2006 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 20.12.2019**

Veer Singh

.....Appellant

VS.

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM : Hon'ble Mr. Justice Jitendra Chauhan

Present : Mr. Anant Kataria, Advocate
for the appellant.

Mr. A.A. Pathak, Additional AG Punjab.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN.J.

This appeal is directed against the order dated 17.03.2006 passed by Sessions Judge, Faridkot vide which the appellant was directed to pay the surety amount of Rs.20,000/-.

It is contended that in FIR No.28 dated 18.02.2004 registered under Sections 364 and 506 IPC at Police Station City, Faridkot, one Satpal had been facing the trial. Appellant Veer Singh stood surety for accused Satpal. However, Satpal had jumped the bail. The appellant was directed to produce said Satpal in the Court but he defaulted. It is further contended that with the best efforts made by the appellant, accused Satpal could not be produced in the Court however, a heavy amount has been imposed upon the appellant. Lastly, a prayer has been made for reduction of the amount.

Learned State counsel contends that the appellant being surety is bound either to produce the accused or to pay the amount of

surety-bonds furnished by him.

Heard.

It is to be seen that at the time of release of Satpal on bail, the appellant had furnished surety bonds either to produce Satpal in the Court as and when directed or to pay the amount of surety bonds in case of default. The appellant was afforded several opportunities to produce the accused in the Court. Despite the issuance of warrants of arrest, the presence of the accused could not be secured. In such circumstances, the appellant, being the surety is bound to honour the surety bond furnished by him before the Court. The amount is not on the higher side. There is no scope for reduction of the amount.

Dismissed.

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

20.12.2019

SN

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes/No
Whether reportable :	Yes/No