



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

129

**CRM-M-52667-2025
Decided on : 18.09.2025**

Randhir @ Bhole

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: None.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. On a call given by the High Court Bar Association, lawyers are observing strike today and not appearing in the Court(s).
2. Instant petition, under Section 528 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 482 Cr.P.C.), has been filed for quashing of the order dated 15.04.2025 (Annexure P-3), passed by Ld. Addl. Sessions Judge, Palwal, whereby after cancelling the bail of the petitioner, non-bailable warrants have been issued against him, on account of his non-appearance in case FIR No. 214, dated 02.04.2018, under Sections 147, 148, 149, 323, 186, 332, 353, 283, 307, 427, 109, 114 of IPC and 8A of NH Act, 3,4 of PDPP Act and 25 of the Arms Act, registered at Police Station Camp Palwal, District Palwal (Annexure P-1).
3. It has been averred in the petition that after being released on bail on 02.05.2018 (Annexure P-2), petitioner was continuously appearing before the trial Court. However, it is only once, i.e., on 15.04.2025 that the petitioner failed in appearing before the Court, because he had noted a wrong date of hearing, i.e., 30.07.2025 instead of 15.04.2025. Therefore, petitioner did not appear on the date fixed, and due to his non-appearance, learned Trial

Court while cancelling his bail bonds, forfeited his surety bonds to the State and issued non-bailable warrants of arrest against the petitioner.

Thus, that absence of the petitioner was neither intentional nor deliberate, but due to the reasons, as mentioned above.

4. It has been further averred in the petition that now petitioner is ready to join the process of law, however, he be directed to be released on bail, on his surrendering before the Court and thus, be protected from arrest. In case, one opportunity is granted, petitioner also undertakes that he would not absent himself in future, without there being prior permission from the Court, and fully cooperate for early disposal of the trial.

5. Since, on a call given by the High Court Bar Association, lawyers are observing strike today and not appearing in the Court(s), this Court is of the view that dispute raised through the present petition can be decided *in limine* and without calling the other side here, because the way this Court intends to dispose of the present petition, no prejudice would be suffered by the complainant *qua* his rights.

6. In number of cases, wherein, accused stopped appearing in criminal cases after being released on bail and thereby compelling the Court to issue non-bailable warrants by cancelling the bail already granted or such accused is declared 'Proclaimed Person'/Proclaimed Offender', after examining the facts, this Court has formulated to apply a uniform method by satisfying itself that such accused would appear before the concerned Court, to enable it to proceed further instead of delaying the proceedings to await the presence of accused.

Intentional or unintentional default of the accused can be dealt with by examining the facts from case to case in which he is involved, and where it is realised that absence or prolonged absence of such accused is

intentional to evade the process of law, he/she can be penalized after examining the nature of crime in which he is facing the proceedings and thereupon by imposing some cost amount subject to his/her capacity to pay.

Primary object of every Court is only to examine the commission of crime in question before it, *vis a vis*, the person/accused, who is subjected to such proceedings, and if possible justice be imparted at the earliest without unnecessary delay. It is not expected that undue time would be devoted in securing the presence of absconded accused and also to waste energy by enforcing the special mechanism to arrest such accused.

Considering all such aspects, this Court in the case of ***Ashish Kumar Honda @ Ashish Handa Vs. State of Punjab, 2022 (4) RCR (criminal) 765; Law Finder Doc Id # 20238111*** considered similar plea of appearance, expressed at the instance of the accused, who failed to appear before the Court at appropriate time, and observed that:

“paramount consideration of the Court is to secure presence of accused on each and every date for speeding up the trial for its final conclusion. Already Courts are flooded with so much litigation, resulting in slow pace of work, because of more than one reason. The required energy and manpower be used for expediting the proceedings of the Court, instead of running after the accused persons to get hold of them.”

Again, this Court has considered the aforementioned similar plea in case ***Veena @ Veena Devi v. State of Punjab (CRM-M-2206-2025, decided on 16.01.2025.***

7. After examining the relevant material available on record, it is noticed that petitioner has remiss in appearing before the Court due to some unavoidable circumstances, and consequently, on 15.04.2025, impugned order cancelling the bail and issuance of non-bailable warrants of arrest, has been passed against him. It also cannot be left unnoticed that on coming to know about passing of the impugned order, petitioner has moved the present

petition, showing his inclination to submit himself before the trial Court.

8. In totality of circumstances, I am of the view that the petitioners can be given one chance to appear before the trial Court, so that proceedings may restart and continue in smooth manner. Accordingly, plea of the petitioner is accepted. Impugned order dated 15.04.2025 (P-3) is hereby **set aside** to the extent of issuance of non-bailable warrants against the petitioner, and he is directed to be released on bail, in the eventuality of surrender by him before the trial Court on or before **14.10.2025**.

The petitioner shall also furnish fresh bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court, in case the bail bonds have already been forfeited. Besides, petitioner would also submit specific undertaking/affidavit that he will keep appearing during the proceedings of the trial in future and the proceedings would not be delayed because of his conduct.

However, this order shall be subject to the payment of Rs.10,000/- as costs, to be deposited by the petitioner in an Old Age Home of the area, as may be decided by the learned Trial Court. The Trial Court shall also specify the time frame within which such costs will be required to be deposited, but not more than two weeks, failing which this order would not be of any advantage to the petitioner.

9. **With aforementioned terms, present petition stands disposed of.**

Misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

September 18, 2025

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No