



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-11878-2025
Date of decision :29.07.2025

JAI KARAN ALIAS JAIKARAN SINGH
... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA
...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present: Mr. Vikas Bishnoi, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vikram Singh, Asstt. A.G., Haryana.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J. (ORAL)

On 03.03.2025, the following order was passed:-

By way of present petition filed under Section 528 of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023 (BNSS), the petitioner seeks quashing of the order dated 24.01.2025 (Annexure P-3) passed by learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Sirsa, in case No. CHI-1484-2024, titled as ‘State vs. Vipin and others’ vide which the bail order of the petitioner has been cancelled and bail/surety bonds were cancelled and forfeited to the State and the petitioner had been summoned through nonailable warrants of arrest in case FIR as mentioned below: -

FIR No.	Dated	Sections	Police Station
26	06.08.2024	318(4) and 61(2) of the BNS	Cyber Crime, Sirsa, District Sirsa

2. Heard.
3. It is, inter alia, contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner after having been granted the concession of bail vide order dated 11.11.2024, passed by learned Sessions Judge, Sirsa, in case FIR (supra) (Annexure P-2), had been regularly appearing in the learned Trial Court.



He contends that on 24.01.2025, the petitioner could not appear in the Court on account of ill health, as is evident from the medical certificate dated 24.01.2025 (Annexure P-4), issued by the Government hospital and his counsel has moved an application seeking exemption on medical grounds, which, however, was declined by the learned Trial Court without any justifiable reasons and proceeded to pass the impugned order (Annexure P-3), cancelling the bail of the petitioner and issuance of nonailable warrants of arrest. He contends that now the matter is pending for 06.03.2025 for the presence of the petitioner and the petitioner is ready to face the trial. Hence, seeks anticipatory bail as his absence on the date fixed was not intentional but on account of medical exigency.

4. Notice of motion, returnable for 20.03.2025.

5. On the asking of the Court, Mr. Arun Kumar Gujjar, AAG, Haryana, who is present in Court, accepts notice and does not dispute the factual matrix of the case.

6. Keeping in view the above facts and circumstances, the petitioner is directed to appear before the learned Trial Court/Judge on duty/Duty Magistrate on or before 06.03.2025 and in that event, learned Trial Court/Judge on duty/Duty Magistrate will admit the petitioner on interim bail subject to its satisfaction on his furnishing requisite bail/surety bonds.

7. The petitioner shall also furnish a specific undertaking before the learned Trial Court/Judge on duty that, in future, he would be regularly appearing before the concerned Court on each and every date and in case of some exigency, he will seek prior permission of the concerned Court qua his exemption to appear on the date fixed.”

3. In compliance of the aforementioned order, the petitioner has surrendered and has been granted the concession of bail by the Court of Addl. Chief Judicial Magistrate.



CRM-M-11878-2025

-3-

4. In view of the above, no further orders are required to be passed by this Court.

5. It is expected that the petitioner shall not absent himself from Trial without sufficient cause.

Disposed of.

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

29.07.2025
JITESH

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