

CRM-M-45767 of 2019

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

CRM-M-45767 of 2019

Date of Decision: 02.12.2019

Surajbhan

..... Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Devender Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Surender Singh, AAG, Haryana.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (ORAL)

By this petition, the petitioner seeks that upon him having been admitted to bail by the trial court in 31 criminal cases registered against him under the provisions of the Electricity Act, 2003, the trial court should not insist upon him producing 31 persons to stand surety for him and that the single person that he has produced by way of such surety, be accepted to so stand for him in all 31 cases.

Learned State counsel, looking at the affidavit filed by the DSP, does not object to the aforesaid contention.

That being so and otherwise also, subject to the trial court being satisfied that the person standing surety the petitioner in all 31 cases is actually in a position to stand as such surety, the petition is allowed, with the petitioner to be admitted to bail in all 31 cases upon him furnishing bail and surety bonds as have been already directed to be paid by the trial Court, (in each single order admitting

CRM-M-45767 of 2019

him to bail). However, to repeat, the trial court shall satisfy itself to the aforesaid effect, that the person who stands for the petitioner as surety, is financially and otherwise capable of standing as such surety in all 31 cases, and that bail and surety bonds are paid in respect of each case, as have been ordered to be furnished in respect of each individual case.

December 02, 2019
dinesh

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable	No.