

**CRM-M-47030 of 2021
Date of Decision: 12.11.2021**

Sahil

...Petitioner

Versus

Inderpal Singh

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Naveen Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.(ORAL)

The limited question before this Court is whether the convict/petitioner can be burdened to furnish the surety bonds again without his fault, which he had earlier furnished.

Reference has been made to order dated 06.07.2021 (Annexure P-5), which is extracted below :-

“Today appellant has furnished his personal bond in the sum of Rs.50,000/-, as per order dated 31.05.2021 passed by the Court of Sh. Rajeev K. Beri, the then ld. ASJ, Ludhiana. However, he suffered a separate statement seeking 15 days time to furnish the surety bond in the sum of Rs.50,000/-. Personal bond is accepted and attested. On request of appellant, let this file be put up on 22.07.2021 for furnishing of surety bond by the appellant. Relevant document be also produced by the parties on that date.”

Since there is no allegation that the convict has jumped the bail during the pendency of appeal, which is pending from the last 9 years, hence there is no need to furnish the surety bonds again and again.

Consequently, the present petition is allowed. The impugned order dated 06.07.2021 is set aside qua the condition of furnishing surety bonds and the personal bonds furnished by the petitioner on 06.07.2021, is sufficient to cause appearance.

**(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE**

November 12, 2021

Manpreet

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