



CRM-M-831-2025

-1-

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

CRM-M-831-2025

Date of decision: 13.01.2025

**INDREESH VERMA @ INDEESH VERMA
@ SAURAV**

...PETITIONER**VERSUS****STATE OF PUNJAB****...RESPONDENT**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

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

Mr. Amandeep Singh, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023, for quashing the impugned order dated 28.11.2024 (Annexure P-5) passed by the trial Court vide which the bail order of the petitioner has been cancelled and non-bailable warrants has been issued against the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.107 dated 18.05.2023, under Section 21, 61, 85 of NDPS Act, 1985, registered at Police Station Division No.8, District Jalandhar.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was on bail and had been appearing on each and every date after grant of regular bail. However, on one occasion i.e. on 28.11.2024, he could not appear before the trial Court due to an inadvertent and bonafide mistake as he mistakenly noticed the next date as 28.12.2024. He also submits that he may be protected from arrest by granting him one more chance to furnish the fresh bail bonds. He will abide by all the terms and conditions as imposed by the Court.

**CRM-M-831-2025****-2-**

4. On asking of the Court, Mr. Amandeep Singh, DAG, Punjab has put in appearance and accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. He submits that the petitioner has willfully remained absent from the proceedings of learned Trial Court and thus, does not deserve any sympathy. Therefore, petitioner should be directed to surrender before the Court and to face trial.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material on record.

6. While considering the submissions, this Court is of the view that instead of taking negative approach, the plea of the petitioner requires to be considered and by keeping in mind that one more chance can be afforded to the petitioner to appear before the trial Court so that the proceedings can be re-initiated and the same be finalized at the earliest because the Courts are already flooded with so much litigations resulting in slow pace of work. The required energy and manpower be used for expediting the proceedings of the Court, instead of running after the accused persons to get hold of them.

7. Therefore, in the totality of circumstances, I am of the opinion that granting the petitioner an opportunity to appear before the trial Court, subject to the payment of Rs. 10,000/- as costs, to be deposited with the District Legal Services Authority, Jalandhar, would serve the ends of justice. This approach would also save considerable time, effort, and resources in ensuring the petitioner's presence.

8. Therefore, it is directed that if petitioner on his own appears before the learned trial Court on or before 31.01.2025, he would be released on bail subject to his furnishing fresh bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court. Besides, petitioner would submit specific undertaking/affidavit that he will keep

appearing during the proceedings of the trial in future and the proceedings would

**CRM-M-831-2025****-3-**

not be delayed because of his conduct.

9. In view of above, **the present petition is allowed.**

10. However, it is made clear that the bail order would be subject to the deposit of an amount of Rs.10,000/- with the District Legal Services Authority, Jalandhar.

11. Needless to mention here that on compliance of all the conditions mentioned here-in-above, impugned order dated 28.11.2024 (Annexure P-5) and the subsequent orders would become inoperative *qua* the petitioner.

13.01.2025

*renubala***(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No