



284

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

**CRM-M-26684-2025
Date of Decision:26.05.2025**

JOBANPREET SINGH

...PETITIONER

VS.

STATE OF HARYANA

...RESPONDENT

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present : Mr. Kuldeep Singh Siwach, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Birender Bikram, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 528 BNSS with a prayer to quash the impugned order dated 29.03.2025 (Annexure P-3) passed by the Additional Sessions Judge, Fatehabad, whereby the bail of the petitioner was cancelled and the bail bonds and surety bonds were ordered to be forfeited to the State and the petitioner was ordered to be summoned through non-bailable warrants of arrest in FIR No.360 dated 20.08.2020, under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 474, 198, 201, 120-B of IPC 1860 & Section 12(1) B of Passport Act 1967, Section 7, 8, 12 of Prevention of Corruption Act 1988



and Section 66C, 66D of I.T. Act 2000, registered at Police Station City Tohana, District Fatehabad.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner was falsely involved in the FIR, which was registered on 20.08.2020 and thereafter, he was ordered to be released on bail by this Court. Learned counsel further contends that the petitioner was regularly appearing before the Trial Court and never misused the concession of bail. However, the petitioner has been falsely implicated in a case FIR No.13 of 2025 registered at Police Station Harike, District Tarn Taran and he could not appear before the trial Court on 29.03.2025. Due to non-appearance of the petitioner, the trial Court had cancelled the bail and the bail bonds and surety bonds were ordered to be forfeited to the State and the petitioner was ordered to be summoned through non-bailable warrants of arrest. Learned counsel for the petitioner next contends that the petitioner is ready to surrender before the Court and join the trial proceedings. He further contends that the petitioner shall appear on each and every date of hearing, before the trial Court and shall not absent himself during the Court proceedings.

3. Learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner had not appeared intentionally before the trial Court and there is no illegality in the impugned order dated 29.03.2025 passed by the Additional Sessions Judge, Fatehabad and the petitioner does not deserve the concession of bail. He has also filed Status report by way of affidavit of Deputy Superintendent of Police,



H.Q. Fatehabad (Haryana) on behalf of the respondent-State and the same is taken on record.

4. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

5. It is not in dispute that that the petitioner was on bail earlier and was regularly appearing before the trial Court. However, on 29.03.2025, he could not appear before the trial Court, as he has been arrested in a case FIR No.13 of 2025 registered at Police Station Harike, District Tarn Taran. Thus, taking a lenient view of the matter, the petitioner is permitted to surrender before the trial Court/Duty Magistrate within a period of two weeks from today and on his surrender, he shall be admitted to bail subject to furnishing bail bonds and surety to the satisfaction of the concerned Court.

6. At the time of furnishing of bail bonds, the petitioner shall also file an affidavit before the concerned Court that he shall continue to appear before the Court on each and every date of hearing and shall not absent himself during the court proceedings, except with prior permission of the Court.

7. The Trial Court/Duty Magistrate shall also be at liberty to impose any other conditions, as it deems fit in the peculiar facts and circumstances of case.

8. The petition stands allowed in the above terms.

9. During the course of arguments, learned State counsel has pointed out that in the present case, there are several accused, who are not appearing regularly before the trial Court and are moving various applications for



exemption from personal appearance. The trial Court is directed to take a strict view of this matter and not to grant any exemption from personal appearance to any of the accused in the present case without any justifiable reasons. The trial Court shall also ensure that due to absence of the accused, the trial does not get delayed unnecessarily.

26.05.2025
vipin

(N.S. SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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