



- 1 -

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

**146**

**CRM-M-21465-2025  
Date of decision: 24.04.2025**

SATPAL SINGH

....Petitioner

**Versus**

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH**

Present : Mr. T.K. Hundal, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amandeep Singh, DAG, Punjab.

**SANJAY VASHISTH. J.(Oral)**

1. The instant petition has been filed by the petitioner-Satpal Singh, aged about 47 years for quashing of the order dated 17.01.2025, whereby bail of the petitioner has been cancelled and warrant of arrest has been issued along with forfeiture of bail bonds, during the pendency of appeal i.e. CRA-65-2024.
2. Petitioner has been convicted for committing an offence under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, on account of bouncing of cheque and therefore has been sentenced by learned trial Court for a period of two years and has also been ordered to pay a compensation of Rs.18,44,000/-. On assailing the said judgment before the learned Appellate Court in CRA-65-2024, petitioner was ordered to be released on bail and rather 20% of the compensation ordered by



- 2-

learned trial Court has also been deposited by the petitioner.

3. By referring to para 3 of the petition, counsel for the petitioner submits that on 17.01.2025, the petitioner could not appear before the learned trial Court on account of the fact that inadvertently he had noted down the wrong date i.e. 17.02.2025 instead of 17.01.2025. Resultantly bail order of the petitioner was cancelled and bail bonds were forfeited to the State. Learned counsel, thus, submits that absence of the petitioner was neither intentional nor deliberate, but due to the reasons, as mentioned above.

4. Learned Counsel further submits that now petitioner is ready to join the process of law, however, he be directed to be released on bail, on his surrendering before the Court and thus, be protected from arrest. In case, one opportunity is granted, petitioner undertakes that he would not absent himself in future, without there being prior permission from the Court, and fully cooperate for early disposal of the trial.

5. Notice of motion.

6. Learned State counsel puts an appearance, and opposes the request of the petitioner by submitting that petitioner does not deserve any sympathy, because, he has misused the concession of bail granted by the Court. Learned State counsel by pointing out the irresponsible conduct of the petitioner, submits that there is every possibility that for the purpose of delaying the trial, he would again be absenting during the proceedings.

7. In number of cases, wherein, accused stopped appearing in criminal cases after being released on bail and thereby compelling the Court to issue non-bailable warrants by cancelling the bail already granted or such accused is



- 3-

declared 'Proclaimed Person'/Proclaimed Offender', after examining the facts, this Court has formulated to apply a uniform method by satisfying itself that such accused would appear before the concerned Court, to enable it to proceed further instead of delaying the proceedings to await the presence of accused.

8. Intentional or unintentional default of the accused can be dealt with by examining the facts from case to case in which he is involved, and where it is realised that absence or prolonged absence of such accused is intentional to evade the process of law, he/she can be penalized after examining the nature of crime in which he is facing the proceedings and thereupon by imposing some cost amount subject to his/her capacity to pay.

9. Primary object of every Court is only to examine the commission of crime in question before it, *vis a vis*, the person/accused, who is subjected to such proceedings, and if possible justice be imparted at the earliest without unnecessary delay. It is not expected that undue time would be devoted in securing the presence of absconded accused and also to waste energy by enforcing the special mechanism to arrest such accused.

10 Considering all such aspects, this Court in the case of ***Ashish Kumar Honda @ Ashish Handa Vs. State of Punjab, 2022 (4) RCR (criminal) 765; Law Finder Doc Id # 20238111*** 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*



- 4-

*persons to get hold of them.”*

Again, this Court has considered the aforementioned similar plea in case **Veena @ Veena Devi v. State of Punjab (CRM-M-2206-2025, decided on 16.01.2025.**

11. 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 due to the reasons already mentioned, and consequently, on 17.01.2025, impugned order cancelling the bail and issuance of warrants of arrest, has been passed against him. It also cannot be left unnoticed that as and when the petitioner came to know about the passing of impugned order, he has immediately moved the present petition, showing his inclination to submit himself before the trial Court.

12. In totality of circumstances, I am of the view that the petitioner can be given one chance to appear before the trial Court, so that proceedings may restart and continue in smooth manner. Accordingly, plea of the petitioner is accepted. Impugned order dated 17.01.2025 is hereby **set aside** to the extent of issuance of warrants of arrest, and petitioner is directed to surrender before the trial Court on or before 12.05.2025.

13 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 he will keep appearing during the proceedings of the trial in future and the proceedings would not be delayed because of their conduct.

14 However, this order shall be subject to the payment of Rs.10,000/- as costs, to be deposited by the petitioner in an Old Age Home of the area, as may be



decided by the learned Trial Court. The Trial Court shall also specify the time frame within which such costs will be required to be deposited, but not more than two weeks, failing which this order would not be of any advantage to the petitioner.

15. With aforementioned terms, present petition stands disposed of.

24.04.2025  
amandeep

(SANJAY VASHISTH)  
JUDGE

|                            |   |        |
|----------------------------|---|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned. | : | Yes/No |
| Whether Reportable.        | : | Yes/No |