

122 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-12285-2024
Date of decision: 11.03.2024

Amritpal Singh

Versus

State of Punjab ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Gagan Preet Saini, Advocate and
Mr. Pardeep Kumar Kapila, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Subhash Godara, Addl.A.G., Punjab.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

The present petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. seeking quashing/setting aside of impugned order dated 08.12.2022 (Annexure P-4) in case bearing FIR No.105 dated 11.07.2020 (Annexure P-1) under Sections 22/25, Act No.61 of the NDPS Act, 1985 registered at Police Station Sadar Budhlada, District Mansa, whereby, the bail order has been cancelled and bail bonds/surety bonds of the petitioner have been cancelled and forfeited to the State followed by issuance of non-bailable warrants and now the case is fixed for 23.05.2024.

2. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that the petitioner was on regular bail and was regularly appearing before the learned trial Court but on 08.12.2022, he could not appear before the learned trial Court due to some unavoidable circumstances and due to his non-appearance, his bail bonds/surety bonds were cancelled and forfeited to the State and non-bailable warrants along with notice to his surety were issued. On 31.03.2023, 31.05.2023, 12.10.2023, 18.12.2023, 27.02.2024, fresh non-

bailable warrants were issued against him and now the case is fixed for 23.05.2024.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the non-appearance of the petitioner was not deliberate and intentional and thus, aggrieved by the said order, he has approached this Court by way of instant petition. It is contended that the impugned order is liable to be set aside on the ground of unintentional non-appearance of the petitioner due to unavoidable circumstances.

4. It is also submitted that the petitioner undertakes to appear before the trial Court on each and every date.

5. Notice of motion.

6. Mr. Subhash Godara, Addl.A.G., Punjab, who is present in Court, accepts notice for the respondent and submits that the impugned order has been passed on the sole ground of the absence of the petitioner, however, it is not disputed by him that petitioner was already on bail and had been appearing before the trial Court.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record of the case with their able assistance and with the consent of parties, the matter is taken up for final disposal.

8. A perusal of the order dated 08.12.2022 (Annexure P-4) reflects that the trial Court proceeded to pass the extreme order of cancellation of bail for the solitary absence of petitioner. Many a times, the accused can be prevented by sufficient reasons to put an appearance before the Court on a given date and, therefore, it necessarily cannot be construed as a deliberate and wilful absence. The explanation offered for non appearance before the trial

Court is justified and, therefore, the same is accepted.

9. While the scheme of criminal justice system necessitates curtailment of personal liberty to some extent, it is of the utmost importance that the same is done in line with the procedure established by law to maintain a healthy balance between personal liberty of the individual-accused and interests of the society in promoting law and order. Such procedure must be compatible with Article 21 of the Constitution of India i.e. it must be fair, just and not suffer from the vice of arbitrariness or unreasonableness.

10. The sole purpose of issuance of non-bailable warrants is to secure presence of the accused before the trial Court. The petitioner in the present case has himself come forward and has undertaken to appear before the trial Court on each and every date.

11. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, the present petition is allowed. The impugned order dated 08.12.2022 (Annexure P-4), vide which the bail bonds and bail order of the petitioner was cancelled and non-bailable warrants were issued, is hereby set aside.

12. The petitioner is directed to appear before the trial Court within a period of two weeks from today and on his doing so, he shall be admitted to bail on his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court, along with costs of Rs.30,000/- to be deposited with the Poor Patient Welfare Fund, PGIMER, Chandigarh, for wasting precious time of the Court.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

11.03.2024

Neha	Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
	Whether reportable	:	Yes/No