



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

CRM-M-52085-2025
Date of decision: 16.09.2025

ANMOL SINGH ALIAS VICKY

...Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR

Present: Mr. Rahul Garg, Advocate
for the petitioner.

YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023 for quashing of order dated 27.08.2025 (Annexure P-4) passed by Ld. Judge, Special Court, Mansa whereby bail of the petitioner has been cancelled and bail bonds have been forfeited and non-bailable warrants has been issued in case arising out of FIR No.30 dated 06.03.2025 under Section 21 of NDPS Act (Sections 27, 29/61/85 of NDPS Act added later on) registered at Police Station City 2, Mansa, District Mansa, on account of his absence.

2. Upon notice, Mr. G.S. Dhaliwal, AAG, Punjab, has appeared and accepts notice on behalf of the State.

3. I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel and have gone through the material on the file.

4. A perusal of the record shows that vide order dated 03.07.2025, the application moved by petitioner-Anmol Singh @ Vicky seeking some time to furnish surety bond was allowed and he was released on bail on



furnishing of personal bond and was permitted to furnish the surety bond within seven days. Thereafter, case was adjourned to 19.07.2025, on which date, he did not appear and notice was issued to the petitioner for 02.08.2025. On 02.08.2025, the Presiding Officer was on leave and file was put up before some other Presiding Officer and case was adjourned to 27.08.2025 for issuing notice to the petitioner. On 27.08.2025 also, petitioner did not appear and the bail was cancelled on account of the fact that he had failed to furnish the surety bond and had violated the conditions under which he was ordered to be released on bail on furnishing of personal bond. In this manner, sufficient opportunities were given to the petitioner to furnish surety bond and a lenient view had been taken by the Court when he was released on bail merely on furnishing of personal bond. In case, petitioner was unable to appear before the Court on the dates fixed for furnishing of surety bond, he ought to have appeared before the Court and sought some time to furnish the surety bond but he continuously remained absent for four dates and trial court was thus constrained to cancel the bail as it had no other option except to cancel the bail. Thus, no illegality or infirmity has been committed in cancelling the bail by way of the impugned order dated 27.08.2025 (Annexure P-4), and the same thus does not call for any interference.

5. In view of the above, the present petition is hereby dismissed.

(YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR)
JUDGE

16.09.2025
Priyanka Thakur

Whether speaking/reasoned :
Whether Reportable :

Yes/No
Yes/No