

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

106

CRM-M-50618-2021

Date of Decision: December 03, 2021

Vinod @ Vinod Kumar Jindal

.....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

.....Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Kunal Dawar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sumit Gupta, Addl. AG, Haryana.

(Through Video Conferencing)

ANOOP CHITKARA J. (ORAL)

Through the present petition, a limited prayer has been made for which the petitioner has come up before this Court that he be permitted to be released on common surety and common personal bonds in all the 16 FIRs.

This Court is inclined to accept first part of the prayer that instead of separate sureties, one surety would suffice for all the cases. It is for the surety to ensure the presence in the trial and if the surety is satisfied, it cannot be insisted that in every case there should be separate surety. Furthermore, if one surety is ready for common surety, then there should be no objection in accepting such surety bonds. As far as second prayer is concerned that he should be released on common personal bonds, that prayer is legally not maintainable because personal bonds have to be separate for all cases.

Given above, the petitioner is allowed to give a common surety for all the cases.

Consequently this petition is **allowed**. As mentioned in the table

at Annexure P-1, in case some one surety is willing to stand as sureties in all the cases, then all the trial Courts which are dealing with these matters, shall accept one common surety, subject to the surety satisfying all conditions of every case imposed by the trial Court. However the petitioner accused shall furnish separate personal bonds in all the 16 cases.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

December 03, 2021
anju rani

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