



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

130

CRM-M-53843-2025

Date of Decision : 24.09.2025

ABHISHEK JAIN**...Petitioner****VERSUS****STATE OF HARYANA****...Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE AARADHNA SAWHNEY**

Present: Mr. S.K. Tripathi, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Shweta Nahata, DAG, Haryana.

AARADHNA SAWHNEY, J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioner, an accused in case FIR No.190 dated 04.12.2019, registered against him for commission of offences punishable u/s 406, 420, 120-B IPC at Police Station Sector 20, Panchkula, has prayed for quashing of orders dated 06.06.2022 (Annexure P-7) & 16.07.2025 (Annexure P-9) passed by learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, Panchkula, vide which non-bailable warrants were issued to procure his presence and proclamation proceedings under Section 82 Cr.P.C. were initiated, respectively.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that criminal proceedings in the aforesaid FIR were initiated against the petitioner by the complainant under some mistaken impression. Subsequently, however, misunderstandings were sorted out. Both the parties compromised the dispute. In pursuance thereof, settlement deed dated 21.01.2021 (Annexure P-2) was also placed before the



Court concerned, accompanied by the affidavit of the complainant, wherein he had deposed that the matter has been amicably settled and he has no objection with regard to the grant of bail to the petitioner. Based on the above two documents and the statement of the complainant, learned JMIC, Panchkula granted the concession of bail to the petitioner.

Learned counsel next submits that petitioner was under some mistaken impression that his presence is not needed on account of the fact that the matter has been compromised and thus, did not appear before the Court concerned.

It is in this backdrop the aforesaid two orders have been assailed by the petitioner on the ground that his absence from the Court were not intentional but on account of aforesaid misunderstanding operating in his mind i.e. that the matter having been settled between the parties, his presence is not needed. Thus, learned counsel submits that a lenient view in favour of the present petitioner be taken, who undertakes to appear before the trial Court on the date fixed.

3. ASI Kuldeep Singh present in person in the Court, submits that complainant appeared before him and moved an application mentioning therein that the entire settlement amount has been received by him. Copy of the same has been placed on record.

4. Heard. Documents perused.

In view of the above, plea of the petitioner is accepted. Impugned orders dated 06.06.2022 (Annexure P-7) & 16.07.2025 (Annexure P-9) are hereby **set aside** to the extent of issuance of non-bailable warrants to procure presence of the petitioner and initiation of proclamation proceedings under Section 82 Cr.P.C., respectively. Petitioner is directed to appear before the learned trial Court on



29.09.2025. 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

24.09.2025
Nisha Yadav

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