

CRM-M-23462-2025

:1:

2025.PHHC.075156



147

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

CRM-M-23462-2025

Date of decision: 29.05.2025

MOBIN

...Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE HARPREET KAUR JEEWAN

Present: Mr. G.S. Goraya, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Aashish Bishnoi, DAG, Haryana.

HARPREET KAUR JEEWAN , J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023 seeking issuance of directions to the Ld. CJM, Kurukshetra that petitioner may be permitted to furnish a single/common surety bond in all the 22 cases registered against the petitioner under Section 136 of Electricity Act, 2003, wherein the Court of Additional Sessions Judge, Kurukshetra has granted bail to the petitioner.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is involved in other 22 criminal cases under Section 136 of Electricity Act. The Court concerned granted bail to the petitioner in all the said criminal cases mentioned at paragraph No.2 of the petition with direction to furnish bail bonds in sum of Rs.30,000/- and Rs.50,000/- with one



surety in like amount to the satisfaction of the Court concerned. Counsel for the petitioner has submitted the bail order in FIR No.642 dated 26.09.2023 under Section 136 of Electricity Act, 2003 at Police Station Shahabad mentioned at paragraph No.2 of the petition, the same is taken on record. Counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner, who belongs to a poor family is not in a position to furnish surety for each 22 criminal cases. Counsel for the petitioner made prayer that petitioner be permitted to furnish only one surety in all the 22 cases.

3. On the other hand, the State counsel submits that petitioner should furnish bail bonds as per conditions given in bail orders mentioned at paragraph No.2 of the petition. However, learned counsel for the State upon instructions has confirmed that the petitioner had already furnished the bail bonds in some cases i.e. serial No.2, 5, 6,15 and 19 as mentioned at paragraph No.2 of the petition. This fact is confirmed that in the other cases, the petitioner has been granted bail by furnishing the bail bonds as so mentioned in Column No.4 of the table given in paragraph No.2 of the present petition.

4. I have considered the submissions made by counsel for the parties.

5. From the perusal of record, it appears that petitioner is involved in 22 criminal cases under Section 136 of Electricity Act, 2003 and the Court concerned has granted bail to the petitioner in all the said cases vide paragraph No.2 of the petition with direction to furnish



personal bond in sum of Rs.50,000/- and Rs.30,000/- with one surety in the like amount in each case. It will be difficult for the petitioner to arrange 22 sureties to furnish bail bonds in 22 criminal cases mentioned at serial No.2 of the petition.

6. In the light of the law laid down by Hon’ble Supreme Court in **“Hani Nishad @ Mohammad Imran @ Vikky’s Vs. The State of Uttar Pradesh”**, the bail orders as mentioned in Column No.2 of the table given in paragraph No.2 of the petition are modified to the extent that petitioner shall furnish separate personal bonds but a common surety for an amount of Rs.5,00,000/- be accepted by the trial Court in each case mentioned in para No.2 of the petition, in which petitioner is yet to furnish bail bonds.

7. The present petition is hereby allowed in aforesaid terms.

(HARPREET KAUR JEEWAN)
JUDGE

29.05.2025

Priyanka Thakur

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No