



CRM-M-31655-2024

**253 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-31655-2024

Date of decision: 29th July, 2024

Shivam Chaurasiya @ Jon

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

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

Mr. Neeraj Poswal, AAG, Haryana.

MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL):-

The instant petition has been filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. seeking issuance of directions to the trial Court for permitting the petitioner to furnish a single surety bond in eight FIRs bearing Nos. 192/2022, 224/2022, 151/2022, 176/2022, 119/2022, 778/2022, 694/2022 and 202/2022, all registered at Police Station Shahabad, wherein he has been granted benefit of bail by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Kurukshetra by orders as Annexures P-1 to P-8 respectively, which pertain to different dates.

2. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that in all the eight above mentioned cases, the petitioner has been ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing personal bonds in the sum of Rs. 50,000/- with one surety in the light amount to the satisfaction of the



concerned Court. It is further submitted that the petitioner belongs to a poor strata and is a daily wage earner. A false recovery has been planted upon him. He is not in a position to arrange eight sureties to the extent of aforementioned amount. He has a permanent abode and there are no chances of his absconding. Prayer has been made for permitting him to furnish only one surety in the aforementioned eight cases. To fortify his contention, learned counsel for the petitioner has placed reliance upon order dated 28.05.2024 passed by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in **CRM-M-25730-2024 (O&M)**, wherein in similar circumstances, the prayer of the petitioner was allowed and he was permitted to be released on bail subject to furnishing personal bond in the sum of Rs. 50,000/- with one surety for all the FIRs as registered against him. Further reliance has been placed upon the order dated 29.10.2018 passed by the **Hon'ble Supreme Court in SLP (Criminal) Nos. 8914-8915 of 2018** titled as '**Hani Nishad @ Mohammad Imran @ Vikky Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh**' decided on 29.10.2018, wherein the order of High Court had been modified and the petitioner was directed to execute personal bonds in all the thirty-one criminal cases registered against him.

3. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has argued that the petitioner may abscond, if he is not bound to furnish surety bonds as per the directions given by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Kurukshetra in each of the FIR registered against him. However, it has been very fairly submitted by him that the conditions for furnishing bonds can be modified,



CRM-M-31655-2024

in the light of the decisions cited by the petitioner's counsel.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel at considerable length and have duly considered the submissions as made by them.

5. The petitioner has admittedly been extended benefit of bail in the aforementioned eight FIR cases, subject to his furnishing personal bonds with one surety in the like amount in each case. Since, it is obviously difficult for him to arrange eight sureties, therefore, in view of the observations as made by Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Hani Nishad's case (supra)*, the orders Annexures P-1 to P-8 are ordered to be modified and it is ordered that the petitioner shall execute personal bond in all the eight cases but surety bond to the extent of Rs. 50,000/- in one case and the bond so executed shall hold good for all the eight cases. Petition stands disposed of in the above mentioned terms.

6. Since the main petition has been disposed of, pending application, if any is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

29th July, 2024

Parveen Sharma

1. Whether speaking/ reasoned	:	Yes / No
2. Whether reportable	:	Yes / No