

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

126

CRM-M-49256-2025
Decided on : 04.09.2025

Sandeep Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Balbir Singh Jaswal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.
(appeared on advance notice)

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. Petitioners, namely Sandeep Singh, aged 29 years, has filed present petition under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023, seeking quashing of order dated 19.12.2024 (P-6), passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar, whereby bail of the petitioner has been cancelled and the bail bonds have been forfeited to the State, and non-bailable warrants have been issued against him

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that FIR No. 23 dated 19.02.2024 was registered against the petitioner under Sections 21/61/85 of the NDPS Act at Police Station Maqboolpura, District Amritsar. After registration of the FIR, petitioner was initially granted interim regular bail vide order dated 02.04.2024 (Annexure P-2) passed by learned Judge, Special Court, Amritsar. However, after filing of the

challan along with FSL report, petitioner was required to appear before the Court and move an application again.

Though petitioner was present before the trial Court on 30.08.2024, when the challan was first submitted, he failed to appear on the subsequent date of hearing, i.e., 30.09.2024. Consequently, on 19.12.2024, by forfeiting the bail bonds, non-bailable warrants were issued by the learned trial Court. Thereafter, on 06.06.2025, anticipatory bail application filed by the petitioner was dismissed as not maintainable.

3. Infact argument of the counsel is that when petitioner was on bail, police was trying to implicate him in another case by raiding his house unnecessarily. Under these compelling circumstances, petitioner went away to the State of U.P (Uttar Pradesh) to avoid his arrest in any false case. Due to this reason petitioner failed to appear before the Court, which resulted in forfeiting of his bail bonds and issuance of non-bailable warrants.

4. Thus, counsel submits that, in view of the circumstances narrated in the petition and as recorded above, petitioner expresses his willingness to join the proceedings before the learned trial Court if granted an opportunity with protection from arrest by setting aside the order dated 19.12.2024 (Annexure P-6).

5. After hearing the petitioner's argument, I have examined the petition thoroughly and thereupon find that the ground of absence taken by the petitioner is wholly unacceptable. There is nothing mentioned by the petitioner that on what specific date his house was raided by police to

implicate him in some false case or whether any complaint was moved by him to any higher authority in that regard, therefore, on the basis of untenable plea, as taken by petitioner in the present petition, the relief prayed cannot be granted to him, therefore, this Court finds no illegality in the order dated 19.12.2024 vide which non-bailable warrants have been issued against the petitioner.

However, this Court realises that petitioner has expressed his eagerness to appear before the Court himself and to join the proceedings. Therefore, present petition is disposed of by making an observation that in case, petitioner submits himself before the trial Court on or before 19.09.2025 and files bail application in the main case, same be decided within seven working days thereafter, in accordance with law. Accordingly, petition stands disposed of.

04.09.2025

rashmi

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE**

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: **YES/NO**
Whether Reportable: **YES/NO**