

Serial No. of Order	Date of Order	Orders with signature	Office Note as to action (if any) taken on order	
02.	16.12.2008	Present: Mr. Ajay Rathi, Advocate for the Petitioner.		
8		Mr. Karma Thinlay, Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.		
	6	Heard arguments in part.		
		List it again in the afternoon session.	J. No.	
		(Justice A. P. Subba) Acting Chief Justice		
03.	16.12.2008 2 p.m.	Present: Mr. Ajay Rathi, Advocate for the Petitioner.		
		Mr. Karma Thinlay, Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.		
		Heard the learned counsel appearing for		
		both the parties.		
		This is an application filed by the		
		petitioner under Section 440(2) read with		
		Section 439(1)(b) of the Code of Criminal		
	W W	Procedure, 1973 for deduction of the bail	The state of	
		amount. The petitioner herein was arrested	. 12	
		on 12 th June, 2008 in connection with Sadar		
		P.S. Case No.79(6)08 under Section 414/34		
	8	of the Indian Penal Code. It is stated that		
	1	the bail application moved by the petitioner		
		after his arrest was allowed since no		
		charge-sheet was filed within the period of		
	-	2 months. As per the bail order, the		
	1	accused was to be released on his		
		furnishing bail amount of Rs.10 lakhs with a		
		reliable surety. One Mrs. P. K. Chettri, a		
		Primary Teacher of Human Resource		
		Development Department, Government of	3-16	
	1	Sikkim, Gangtok produced as surety for the		



Date serial Office Note as to of Orders with signature No. of action (if any) Order Order taken on order petitioner was not acceptable to the learned No other surety could be trial Court. furnished and as such, the petitioner is still in custody. It is submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the amount of Rs.10 lakhs fixed as ball amount is too excessive and the same amounts to denial of bail itself. It is on account of the bail amount being excessive that the accused was unable to furnish the required surety and avail of the ball order. Drawing the attention of this Court to the Order dated 7th October, 2005 passed by this Court in Criminal Revision Petition No.14 of 2005, the learned counsel submitted that the circumstances of the present case being identical a similar order reducing the bail amount was called for. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposed the application mainly on the ground that the case against the accused is serious one and it would be more appropriate for him to approach the learned trial Court for review or for reconsideration of the amount of bail

The provision as contained in Section 440(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 makes it amply clear that every bond executed under Chapter XXXIII relating to bail and bail bonds shall be fixed with due regard to the circumstances of the case and the same shall not be excessive. Thus, keeping in view such clear provision of law

if he was aggrieved by the bail amount fixed

by the Court.

y



erial Da io, of o rder Or	Orders with signature	Office Note as to action (if any) taken on order
	and also the fact that such a redu	action of
	bail amount as prayed for in the	present
	case has once been granted by this	Court in
	a similar matter, I am of the view	v that a
1	reasonable reduction in the amount	t of bail
	is called for in the present case	in the
	interest of justice.	
	Accordingly, the bail amount as	fixed by
	the impugned order passed by the	learned
	Chief Judicial Magistrate, East & N	North at
1	Gangtok on 14 th August, 2008	stands
	reduced to Rs.5 lakhs.	
	The learned counsel for the po	etitioner
	undertakes on his own not to le	ave the
	State on being released on bail	and to
	report to the I.O. of the case eve	ery day.
	Since such a condition is acceptable	e to the
	petitioner on his own it is hereby	directed
	that the petitioner shall report to	I.O. as
	and when required in connection v	with the
	ongoing investigation.	
	Needless to say the accused s	
	tamper with the prosecution evide	nce and
	shall cooperate with the investigation	n.
	The accused shall be released	on his
	furnishing personal bond and surety	bond of
	the amount indicated above	to the
V.	satisfaction to the learned Chief	Judicial
	Magistrate, East & North at Gangtok	stands & Copy & order
	Accordingly, this application	stands & cJM CE+
	disposed of.	lu caro
	Send a copy of this order	to the विकास
	concerned Court for information	on and
	compliance.	
	(Justice A. P. Su Acting Chief Jus	