

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

223)

CRM-M-30205-2019 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 18.09.2019

Sunil @ Sheelu

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Deepak Kundu, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Neeraj Poswal, AAG, Haryana.

Amol Rattan Singh, J. (Oral)

Though learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Rajbir Singh, submits that the recovery of a pistol is to be made from the petitioner (as per the case of the investigating agency), however, it is not denied that when the petitioner was initially admitted to bail by the trial court, the State had not sought cancellation of the bail at any stage, and thereafter his bail bonds were ordered to be forfeited only because he absented himself on one day, after which he had surrendered, as noticed in the order of this Court dated 14.08.2019.

Today, learned State counsel, on instructions, also does not deny that the petitioner had absented himself from the trial proceedings only on one day.

That being so, with 13 witnesses still to be examined, the petition is allowed, with the order dated 14.08.2019, made absolute, on the

same terms and conditions, subject further to the trial court imposing any further condition that may be considered necessary by it.

18.09.2019
vcgarg

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE
Whether reasoned/speaking: Yes
Whether reportable: No