

105

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

**CRM-M-48758-2021 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 22.11.2021**

Naresh Kumar

.. Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

..Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Anuj Arya, Advocate for the petitioner.

...

Manoj Bajaj, J. (Oral)

Petitioner has filed this petition under Section 438 Code of Criminal Procedure for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.272 dated 29.11.2019 under Section 20 NDPS Act, 1985, registered at Police Station Sanoli, District Panipat, who apprehends his arrest at the hands of police, pursuant to the cancellation of his bail vide order dated 10.11.2021 (Annexure P-4), passed by the trial Court.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that vide order dated 09.01.2020, petitioner was granted pre arrest bail by this Court and thereafter, he kept on appearing regularly before the trial Court. However, on 10.11.2021, petitioner did not appear before the trial Court as he went to attend the funeral of his nephew and could not contact his counsel to inform him about the incident and the trial Court proceeded to cancel his bail and forfeited the bail bonds vide order dated 10.11.2021 (Annexure P-4). He submits that the petitioner is ready and willing to participate in the trial proceedings and the date of hearing is now fixed for 17.12.2021.

When learned counsel was confronted with the maintainability

of the petition, he makes a prayer to treat the petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C.

The prayer is accepted.

Notice of motion.

At this stage, Mr. Sukhdeep Parmar, DAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and states that the advance copy of the petition has already been received by him. He opposes the prayer and submits that since the petitioner was well-aware of the date of hearing before the trial Court, but he failed to appear, therefore, the Court is justified in cancelling his bail. However, it is not disputed by him that the case is coming up before the trial Court for hearing on 17.12.2021.

A perusal of the order dated 10.11.2021 (Annexure P-4) reflects that the trial Court proceeded to pass the extreme order of cancellation of bail for the solitary absence of petitioner, who was on bail since 09.01.2020. At times, the accused or his counsel can be prevented by sufficient reasons to put an appearance before the Court on a given date and every such absence cannot be necessarily construed as a deliberate and willful absence. The explanation offered by petitioner for non appearance before the appellate Court appears to be justified and therefore, the same is accepted.

Apart from the above, this Court is of the opinion that the impugned order has been passed recently and in case, the petitioner is allowed to join the trial proceedings, it would facilitate the prosecution to continue with the trial.

Consequently, the impugned order dated 10.11.2021 (Annexure P-4) is set aside subject to appearance of the petitioner before the trial Court

on or before the next date of hearing i.e.17.12.2021 and he is allowed to remain on the same bail bonds and surety bonds. In the event of non-compliance of this order, the order dated 10.11.2021 (Annexure P-4) would remain intact.

Disposed off.

22.11.2021
Jasmine Kaur

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes	No
Whether reportable	Yes	No