



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

CRM-M-53343-2024
Date of decision: 24.10.2024

Vikas

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KARAMJIT SINGH

Present: Mr. Sandeep Saini, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. P.K. Aggarwal, DAG, Haryana.

KARAMJIT SINGH, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking quashing of order dated 07.10.2024 Annexure P-3 passed by the Court of Additional Sessions Judge, Jind vide which the bail bonds of the petitioner were cancelled and he was directed to be summoned through non bailable warrants of arrest in a criminal case having FIR No.263 dated 01.07.2020 under Sections 186, 307, 333, 353 read with Section 34 IPC and 25 of Arms Act, Police Station City Jind, on account of the absence of petitioner in the trial.

2. The counsel for the petitioner inter alia submits that petitioner was granted regular bail by this Court vide order Annexure P-2 and thereafter, the petitioner was regularly appearing in the trial proceedings. However, the petitioner was arrested in one another case having FIR No.112 dated 03.09.2024, Police Station Dwarka (Delhi), registered under Arms Act. Due to his arrest in aforesaid criminal case, the petitioner was unable to appear before the trial Court in the present case on 07.10.2024 which resulted into passing of impugned order Annexure P-3. That the absence of the petitioner was not intentional and petitioner is ready to join the proceedings before the trial Court at the earliest.

3. Notice of motion.



4. Mr. P.K. Aggarwal, DAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the State and submits that earlier petitioner was granted regular bail by this Court but he got absented on 07.10.2024, as a result of which, order Annexure P-3 was passed by the trial Court in accordance with law. It is further submitted that on account of the absence of the petitioner, on 07.10.2024, the prosecution witnesses who were present could not be examined.

5. It appears that this was single default on the part of the petitioner and as per counsel for petitioner, the absence of the petitioner was not intentional and rather at that time petitioner was in custody in some other criminal case which was registered in Police Station Dwarka (Delhi).

6. In light of the above, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the present petition is disposed of in the interest of justice and in order to avoid any further delay in trial and the petitioner is hereby directed to join proceedings before the trial Court within next 10 days and on his doing so, the petitioner is to be released on regular bail by the Court concerned to its own satisfaction and subject to cost of Rs.10,000/- to be deposited by the petitioner with the District Legal Services Authority concerned.

7. Disposed of in aforesaid terms.

24.10.2024

Yogesh

**(KARAMJIT SINGH)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned:-

Yes/No

Whether reportable:-

Yes/No