



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

120

CRM-M-46446-2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision : 17.09.2025

BAWA SINGH

...Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE AARADHNA SAWHNEY

Present: Mr. Barjinder Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Kamalpreet Bawa, DAG, Punjab.

AARADHNA SAWHNEY, J. (ORAL)CRM-34187-2025

By virtue of the present application, petitioner has sought the permission of the Court to place on record the zimni orders passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar appended as Annexure P-7.

For the reasons mentioned in the application, which is supported by an affidavit, the same is allowed. Zimni orders (Annexure P-7) are taken on record.

CRM-M-46446-2025

Petitioner, a co-accused in case FIR No. 126 dated 28.11.2022, registered against him for commission of offences punishable u/s 22, 29, 61, 85 of NDPS Act, at Police Station Ramdas, Amritsar Rural, has prayed for quashing of order dated 26.09.2024 (Annexure P-1) passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar (wrongly mentioned as Sangrur), vide which his bail was cancelled, bail bonds/surety bonds were forfeited to the State, his presence was



sought to be procured through non-bailable warrants and notice was issued to the surety.

2. Learned counsel submits that after the registration of the FIR, petitioner was granted the concession of bail by Special Court, Amritsar on 07.01.2023. Thereafter, petitioner was continuously appearing before trial Court on each and every date. On 26.09.2024, petitioner could not appear before the Court, as he was in custody in another criminal case (FIR No.69 dated 02.09.2023, under Sections 304, 34 of IPC, registered at Police Station Ramdas, Amritsar). Learned counsel draws the attention of the Court to the order dated 22.04.2025 (Annexure P-3) passed by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court, vide which petitioner was granted bail in aforesaid FIR No.69 dated 02.09.2023. Para 8 of the order reveals that the present petitioner was in custody in the said case since 02.09.2023 and was bailed out on 22.04.2025. Resultantly, when the present case was taken up by the learned Additional Sessions Judge on 26.09.2024, petitioner, who was in custody could not appear. It is in this context that the aforesaid order dated 26.09.2024 has been assailed.

Continuing further learned counsel submits that learned trial Court hastily proceeded to cancel the bail of the petitioner, who did not intentionally remained absent, but being in custody in some other case could not put in his appearance. With this backdrop, learned counsel submits to take a lenient view in favour of the present petitioner, who undertakes to appear before the trial Court on the date fixed.

3. Heard. Documents on record perused.

Though it was duty of the petitioner to inform his counsel, the Court about the lodging of another FIR against him, as also that on account the aforesaid reason, he could not to appear before the Court on the day fixed. Nonetheless, with a view that trial should proceed further, lenient view is taken in favour of the petitioner. Court is of the opinion that interest of justice would be served, if



petitioner is directed to appear before the learned trial Court on or before 13.10.2025.

On his appearance before the Court concerned, he shall be deemed to be on bail.

Accordingly, the present petition stands disposed of.

(AARADHNA SAWHNEY)
JUDGE

17.09.2025
Nisha Yadav

<i>Whether Speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>