



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

**CRM-M-2206-2025
DECIDED ON: 16.01.2025**

VEENA ALIAS VEENA DEVI **.....PETITIONER**

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB **.....RESPONDENT**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.

Present: Mr. Manoj R. Sharma, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Amandeep Singh, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed by the petitioner, for quashing of the order dated 05.10.2024 (Annexure P-4), whereby the non-bailable warrants were issued against him, in a case bearing FIR No.98, dated 02.06.2021, under Section(s) 392, 342, 170, 148, 149, 412, 120-B, 450, 452, 395 and 397 of IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act, registered at Police Station Dinanagar, District Gurdaspur.

2. Counsel for the petitioner contends that earlier, vide order dated 05.01.2023, passed in CRM-M-17343-2022 (Annexure P-1), petitioner was granted regular bail by the co-ordinate Bench of this Court and at the time of granting of regular bail, petitioner had been appearing before the Court, on each and every date. It is once on 05.10.2024 that on account of being absent without intimation, her bail was cancelled, and bail bonds were forfeited.

Resultantly, non-bailable warrants were also issued.

3. Counsel for the petitioner also submits that the petitioner is a poor household lady and is a resident of the State of Himachal Pradesh, and in case, one opportunity is granted for releasing her on bail, she undertakes that she would never be absent in future, without there being prior permission from the Court. Further prays that the petitioner be released on bail on the same bail bonds/surety bonds, if not forfeited already by the time of surrendering of the petitioner before the Court.

4. On advance notice, Mr. Amandeep Singh, DAG, Punjab, puts an appearance, and opposes the request of the petitioner by submitting that petitioner does not deserve any sympathy, because, she is involved in serious offence against society. Otherwise also, she has misused the concession of bail granted by the trial Court. Learned State counsel further submits that looking at her behaviour, there is no surety that in future, petitioner would not be absent for the purpose of delaying the trial.

5. In number of cases, this Court has considered similar plea of appearance, expressed at the instance of the accused, who failed to appear before the Court at appropriate time, and observed that paramount consideration of the Court is to secure presence of accused on each and every date for speeding up the trial for its final conclusion. Already Courts are flooded with so much litigation, resulting in slow pace of work, because of more than one reason. 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.

6. I have considered the submissions of both the sides and examined the relevant material available on record. The petitioner has remiss in appearing before the Court only on one date i.e. on 05.10.2024, when impugned order cancelling the bail and issuance of non-bailable warrants has been passed against her. It also cannot be left unnoticed that within two months of the absence from the Court, and on coming to know about passing of the impugned order, the petitioner has moved the present petition, showing her inclination to submit herself before the trial Court.

7. In totality of circumstances, I am of the view that the petitioner can be given one chance to appear before the trial Court. Accordingly, the plea of the petitioner is accepted and she is directed to be released on bail, in the eventuality of surrendering of her before the trial Court on or before 07.02.2025. The petitioner shall also furnish fresh bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court, in case the bail bonds have already been forfeited. Besides, petitioner would also submit specific undertaking/affidavit that she will keep appearing during the proceedings of the trial in future and the proceedings would not be delayed because of her conduct.

8. Present petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

16.01.2025

Lavisha

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>