

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

**CRM-M-55594-2022  
DECIDED ON: 8<sup>th</sup> DECEMBER, 2022**

**ANIL JINDAL**

**.....PETITIONER**

**VERSUS**

**STATE OF HARYANA**

**.....RESPONDENT**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL.**

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

**SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)**

This is a petition under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. for granting permission to the petitioner to furnish common/combined surety and common personal bond in all 69 FIRs in which the petitioner has been granted regular bail vide orders Annexures P-2 to P-70.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has referred to the table/draft annexed as Annexure P-1 and has submitted that the petitioner has been granted the concession of bail in all 69 cases and the orders granting bail to the petitioner are also placed on the record as Annexures P-2 to P-70. It is asserted that vide separate bail orders passed by the Court in each FIR, the petitioner has been directed to be released subject to the personal bonds in some cases along-with sureties in some FIRs, as such the requisite corollary of all these bail orders is that the petitioner will have to furnish minimum 69 sureties for his release in all the FIRs, which otherwise pertain to similar allegations and as such, the condition imposed is totally impractical which has deprived the petitioner of being released on bail despite the same being

granted.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has placed reliance upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Hani Nishad @ Mohammad Imran @ Vikky vs. State of Uttar Pradesh**, decided on 29.10.2018, passed in SLP (Criminal) No. 8914-8915 of 2018.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of Court, Mr. Surender Singh, AAG, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State.

Learned State counsel has opposed the present petition but has not disputed the fact that the petitioner has been granted bail in all the afore-said 69 cases.

Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record with their assistance.

The petitioner has been granted the concession of bail in 69 cases and in most of the cases, bail orders were granted in the year 2021 and yet, the petitioner has not been released from custody in the said cases as the petitioner is not able to furnish separate sureties in each case. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in **Hani Nishad @ Mohammad Imran @ Vikky vs. State of Uttar Pradesh** (supra), has held as under:-

*“Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that even though the Court has granted bail to the petitioner, the petitioner is unable to execute the bail bonds because of the onerous conditions of bail imposed particularly the condition of producing 31 sureties.*

*Considering the submissions, the impugned order is modified to the extent that the petitioner shall execute a personal bond for Rs. 30,000/- (Rupees Thirty thousand only)*

*and the same bond shall hold good for all 31 cases. There shall be two sureties who shall execute the bond for Rs. 30,000/- which bond shall hold good for all the 31 cases. It is clarified that the personal bond so executed by the Petitioner and the bond so executed by the two sureties shall hold good for all the 31 cases.*

*With these observations, the Special Leave Petitions are disposed of.*

*Pending applications, if any, shall stand disposed of.”*

To the similar effect is a judgment of a Co-ordinate Bench of this court in the case of **Suresh Kumar Bawalia vs. State of Haryana** bearing CRM-M-4651 of 2019, which also has been relied upon by learned counsel for the petitioner.

Keeping in view the above said facts and circumstances as well as the law laid down in the above said judgments, a direction is issued to the trial courts that it should accept common two sureties for all 69 cases regarding which the orders have been annexed from Annexures P-2 to P-70.

However, while accepting the bail bonds, the court concerned would verify that the said two sureties are sound and satisfy all the conditions of the bail orders relating to every case.

In addition to the above, the petitioner shall furnish separate personal bonds in each of the 69 cases.

Disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

**(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)**  
**JUDGE**

**8<sup>th</sup> DECEMBER, 2022**

*sham*

|                                  |               |
|----------------------------------|---------------|
| <i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i> | <i>Yes/No</i> |
| <i>Whether reportable</i>        | <i>Yes/No</i> |