



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

CRM-M-39105-2025

Date of decision: 24.07.2025

SUKHDEEP SINGH ALIAS SUKHA

...PETITIONER

V/S

STATE OF HARYANA

...RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Gurdarshan S. Sidhu, Advocate for the petitioner.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. This petition has been filed under Section 528 BNSS, 2023 seeking quashing of impugned order dated 28.05.2025 (Annexures P-2) passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sirsa in case bearing No.NDPS-221 of 2021, assignment of FIR No.113 dated 30.10.2020 registered under Section 22(C) of NDPS Act, 1985 at Police Station Rori, District Sirsa, whereby, the bail of the petitioner has been cancelled and his bail bonds/surety bonds have been forfeited to the State followed by issuance of non-bailable warrants.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was on bail and was regularly appearing before learned trial Court. However, on 16.04.2025, inadvertently, the petitioner noted the next date as 28.06.2025 instead of 28.05.2025 and subsequently, the learned trial Court has cancelled the bail of the petitioner and his non-bailable warrants were issued.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that non-appearance of the petitioner was not deliberate or intentional and thus, aggrieved by the said order, he has approached this Court by way of instant



petition. It is contended that the impugned order is liable to be set aside on the ground of unintentional non-appearance of the petitioner.

4. It is also submitted that the petitioner undertakes to appear before the trial Court on each and every date.

5. Notice of motion.

6. Ms. Geeta Sharma, DAG, Haryana, who is present in Court, accepts notice for the respondent-State and submits that the impugned order has been passed on the sole ground of the absence of the petitioner, however, it is not disputed by him that petitioner was already on bail and had been appearing before the trial Court.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record of the case with their able assistance and with the consent of parties, the matter is taken up for final disposal.

8. Many a times, the accused can be prevented by sufficient reasons to put an appearance before the Court on a given date and, therefore, it necessarily cannot be construed as a deliberate and willful absence. The explanation offered for non-appearance before the Court is justified and, therefore, the same is accepted.

9. While the scheme of criminal justice system necessitates curtailment of personal liberty to some extent, it is of the utmost importance that the same is done in line with the procedure established by law to maintain a healthy balance between personal liberty of the individual-accused and interests of the society in promoting law and order. Such procedure must be compatible with Article 21 of the Constitution of India i.e. it must be fair, just and not suffer from the vice of arbitrariness or unreasonableness.

10. The sole purpose of issuance of non-bailable warrants is to secure presence of the accused before the trial Court. The petitioner in the present case has himself come forward and has undertaken to appear before the trial Court on each and every date.

11. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, the present petition is allowed. The impugned order dated 28.05.2025 (Annexures P-2), vide which, the bail bonds and bail order of the petitioner was cancelled and non-bailable warrants were issued, is hereby set aside.

12. Petitioner is directed to appear before the trial Court within a period of four weeks and on his doing so, he shall be admitted to bail on his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court, along with costs of Rs.5,000/- to be deposited with Poor Patients Welfare Funds, PGIMER, Chandigarh for wasting precious time of the Court.

13. Receipts of payment of cost must be presented before learned trial Court and learned trial Court is directed to verify the same.

14. It is made clear that in case, petitioner fail to appear before the trial Court within a stipulated period, the interim protection granted by this Court shall be deemed to be vacated.

July 24, 2025
manisha

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

(i)	Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
(ii)	Whether reportable	Yes/No