



CRM-M-28659 of 2024

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-28659 of 2024(O&M)
Date of Decision: 31.05.2024

Amit
Versus
State of Haryana

...Petitioner
...Respondent

CORAM :HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KARAMJIT SINGH

Present:- Mr. Vikram Singh, Advocate
For the petitioner.

Mr. Viney Phogat, DAG Haryana.

KARAMJIT SINGH, J.

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 482 Cr.P.C. seeking modification of order dated 14.02.2024 (Annexure P-2) to the extent vide which petitioner has been directed to furnish one local surety to the satisfaction of the trial Court/ Duty Judge, Panipat in a criminal case having FIR No. 676 dated 12.10.2021, under Sections 489-B, 120-B, 34 IPC at Police Station Chandani Bagh Panipat.
2. The counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been granted regular bail in aforesaid criminal case by the Court of Sessions Judge, Panipat vide order dated 14.02.2024 (Annexure P-2), subject to his furnishing personal bond in sum of Rs.1,00,000/- with two sureties in like amount each, out of which one should be local surety to the satisfaction of the Court concerned/ Duty Judge, Panipat. The counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner is resident of Uttar Pradesh and thus it is difficult for him to arrange a local surety in compliance of aforesaid order.



The counsel for the petitioner submits that in place of the said local surety the petitioner is ready to deposit reasonable amount in cash with the Court concerned and that the bail order (Annexure P-2) dated 14.02.2024 be modified accordingly.

3. Notice of motion.
4. Mr. Viney Phogat, DAG Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the State and submits that the petitioner is granted regular bail vide order dated 14.02.2024 (Annexure P-2) passed by the Court of Session Judge, Panipat. It is further submitted that as the petitioner belongs to other State the Court below was right in asking the petitioner to furnish one local surety. The State counsel further submits that in case petitioner is not in a position to furnish local surety then he be directed to deposit certain amount in cash in place of the said local surety.
5. I have considered the submissions made by counsel for the parties.
6. The present petition is hereby disposed of, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case and impugned order, Annexure P-2 is modified to the extent that in place of furnishing of local surety the petitioner is given liberty to deposit cash worth Rs.50,000/- with the Court concerned, which will be subject to final decision in the trial.

(KARAMJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

31.05.2024
Jiten

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