

139

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-13782-2024 (O&M)
Date of decision: 18.03.2024

Mona Sharma @ Mona Beri

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Angad Parmar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

The present petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. read with Section 440 Cr.P.C. for modification of the order dated 04.07.2023, vide which, while granting regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No.115 dated 23.09.2022 under Sections 406, 420, 120-B of IPC and Section 13 of the Punjab Travel Professionals (Regulation) Act, 2014, registered at Police Station Navi Baradari, District Jalandhar, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jalandhar ordered to furnish bail bonds to the tune of Rs.1.00 lac with one surety.

2. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner contends that the petitioner was involved in the FIR (*supra*) and he was granted regular bail by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jalandhar vide order dated 04.07.2023 and ordered to furnish bail bonds in the sum of Rs.1.00 lacs with

one surety in the like amount. He further contends that the petitioner is a widow and is unable to furnish bail bonds of such an excessive amount, due to which she is languishing in jail. Learned counsel thus prays that the amount of Rs.1.00 lac to be furnished as bail bonds may be reduced to some lesser amount.

3. Notice of motion.

4. At this stage, on asking of the Court, Mr. Subhash Godara, Addl. A.G., Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and does not controvert the factual position, but contends that the learned Court below rightly ordered to furnish bail bonds in the sum of Rs.1.00 lacs with one surety.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and after perusing the records of the case with their able assistance, it transpires that the petitioner is a widow and no other member is there in her family, this Court deems fit to reduce the amount of Rs.1.00 lac to be furnished as bail bonds.

6. A similar issue was decided by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *'Mohammed Kunju v. State of Karnataka' 1999 (4) RCR (Criminal) 726* and this Court in *'Bhagat Singh v. State of Haryana' 2018 (2) RCR (Criminal) 337*, *'Mohinder Singh v. The State of Punjab' 2008 (22) RCR (Criminal) 704*, *'Angrej Singh v. State of Punjab' 2010 (4) RCR (Criminal) 580* and *'Gopal Kaur v. State of Punjab' 2011 (6) RCR (Criminal) 1394*, wherein, the penalty imposed under Section 446 of Cr.P.C. was reduced to 1/4th of the amount of surety bonds by holding that the said bonds were on

the higher side.

7. Recently, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **SLP (Crl.) No.3314 of 2024 (Ashok Sandeep Singh Vs. The State of Uttar Pradesh)**, decided on **15.03.2024**, has held that the purpose of directing an accused who has been released on bail to furnish surety is to ensure that the accused is present to answer further proceedings including at the trial. Determining the amount of surety at an unreasonably high amount effectively defeats the very purpose of the grant of bail and infringes the right to life and personal liberty of the accused protected by Article 21 of the Constitution. The Hon'ble Supreme Court, after considering the financial position of the accused and other facts, reduced the amount of surety bonds from Rs.10.00 lacs to Rs.25,000/-.

8. Therefore, in view of the facts and circumstances of the case and the judgments referred to above, the impugned order dated 04.07.2023 is upheld. However, this Court is of the considered opinion that ends of justice will be served if the amount of Rs.1.00 lac to be furnished as bail bonds as ordered by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jalandhar is reduced to Rs.10,000/-.

9. Disposed of, in the aforesaid terms.

[**HARPREET SINGH BRAR**]
JUDGE

18.03.2024
vishnu

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No