

109

2024:PHHC:035476

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-12327-2024
DECIDED ON: 11.03.2024

MUKESH ALIAS MATRI

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Nikhil Mittal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Baljinder Singh Virk, Sr. DAG Haryana.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

1. The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Section 482 Cr.P.C., for issuance of a direction to trial Court/Duty Magistrate that the petitioner may be permitted to furnish a single surety bond in the 4 FIR/cases (Annexure P-1), in which the petitioner has now been granted bail vide order dated 04.03.2024. (Copies of orders granting bail to the petitioner in 4 FIRs are attached at Annexures P-2 to P-5 respectively).
2. The petitioner has prayed for direction permitting him to furnish one surety collectively in all the four FIRs alongwith bail bond of Rs.50,000/- (only), though no reasoning whatsoever has been given qua inability to furnish bail bonds and one surety separately in each FIRs.
3. He has relied upon an order passed by the Apex Court in *Hani Nishad @ Mohammad Imran @ Vikky vs. The State of Uttar Pradesh, SLP (Crl)*

Nos.8914-8915 of 2018, whereby considering the plea of the petitioner therein showing his inability to execute the bail bonds because of onerous condition of bail particularly producing 31 sureties being involved in 31 cases separately, it was directed therein that there shall be two sureties and petitioner was asked to execute the bond of Rs.30,000/-, which shall hold good for all the 31 cases.

4. Though, there is no specific reasoning or excuse coming forth in the instant petition on behalf of the petitioner asking for the said relief, this Court keeping in view the law of equity and to maintain reasonableness in law as well as in the light of order relied upon in *Hani Nishad @ Mohammad Imran @ Vikky (supra)*, only with a view to ensure that the petitioner does not remain confined in custody, despite having been granted bail by the Court on account of inability to fulfil the conditions stipulated in those orders (Annexures P-2 to P-5), the orders dated 04.03.2024 (Annexures P-2 to P-5 respectively) are modified to the extent that the petitioner shall execute a personal bond for Rs.50,000/- (only) and the same bond shall hold good for all four cases/FIRs. He shall also provide two sureties in all the FIRs with the clarification that the personal bond and two sureties so executed by the petitioner shall hold good for all the cases, as involved in the instant petition.

5. With the aforesaid terms, the present petition stands disposed off.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

11.03.2024

Meenu

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