



to be deposited was Rs.75 lakhs not Rs. 50 Lakhs and that order had never been modified. Thus if the petitioner sought substitution of the balance amount to be deposited with security of immovable property as a condition of bail, then having deposited only Rs. 19 lakhs till now the security will have to be of Rs. 56 lakhs. Learned counsel for the petitioner took some time to take instructions in this behalf and on 06.11.2020 stated on instructions that the petitioner is willing to furnish a security of immovable property of Rs.56 lakhs. It is in view thereof we had issued notice.

Learned counsel for the respondent State had entered appearance and states that he has instructions to oppose the request.

We really cannot appreciate such instructions coming from the State as the petitioner cannot be indefinitely detained in prison. More so, he has come up with a reasonable offer. We do believe that State Governments must be more reasonable in their submission when are sought to be made before this Court. The opposition should not be for the sake of opposition.

We thus accede to the request of the petitioner to offer immovable security either of himself or his relative/friend of Rs. 56 lakhs within three months as prayed for and to that extent, the condition for bail

stands modified.

At request of the petitioner, three months time is granted for the said purpose.

In order to facilitate the petitioner to do the needful, the petitioner is granted interim bail for the said purpose making it clear that failure now to comply with the direction would lead to his incarceration again.

IA No.63274/2020 is disposed of accordingly.

MA stands disposed of.

Pending application stands disposed of.

[CHARANJEET KAUR]  
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

[POONAM VAID]  
COURT MASTER (NSH)