



128

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

**CRM-M No.66687 of 2025
Date of decision : 28.11.2025**

Ranjeet Money**.....Petitioner**

versus

State of Punjab**..... Respondent****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ**

Present :- Ms. Bhumika Sachan, Advocate for
Mr. Shivam Grover, Advocate
for the petitioner.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed praying for setting aside the order dated 30.09.2025 (Annexure P-1) passed by the learned Judge, Special Court, Moga, whereby the regular bail of the petitioner has been cancelled in case bearing FIR No.170, dated 30.07.2022, under Sections 21 & 29 of NDPS Act, 1985 (Section 25 of Arms Act added later on), registered at Police Station City Moga, District Moga, Punjab. Further prayer has been made for granting interim bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the present petition.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner was falsely prosecuted in a case bearing FIR No.170, dated 30.07.2022, under Sections 21 & 29 of NDPS Act, 1985 (Section 25 of Arms Act added later on). He has submitted that after registration of the FIR, the petitioner was granted the concession of regular bail by this



Court vide order dated 05.04.2024 passed in CRM-M-57980-2023. He has submitted that after granting bail, the petitioner was regularly appearing before the learned trial Court. He has submitted that on one date, i.e. 30.09.2025, the petitioner could not appear before the learned trial Court as inadvertently, he was noted the wrong date and due to the same. He has further submitted that due to non-appearance of the petitioner before the learned trial Court on the date fixed, i.e. 30.09.2025, his bail order was cancelled and bail bonds/surety bonds were forfeited to the State. He has submitted that warrants of arrest were also issued against the petitioner. He has submitted that absence of the petitioner was *bona fide* and not intentional. He has further submitted that the petitioner is ready to appear before the learned trial Court and abide by the terms and conditions imposed upon him.

3. Notice of motion.

4. On the asking of the Court, Ms. Ramta Chowdhary, DAG, Punjab appears and accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. She, on the other hand, has contended that bail order of the petitioner was rightly cancelled by the learned trial Court and warrants of arrest were issued against him, as he failed to appear in the Court despite orders.

5. I have heard counsel for the parties and perused the record.

6. It is apparent that the petitioner was prosecuted in a case bearing FIR No.170, dated 30.07.2022, under Sections 21 & 29 of NDPS Act, 1985 (Section 25 of Arms Act added later on), registered at Police Station City Moga, District Moga, in which, he was already granted regular bail by this Court vide order dated 05.04.2024. Due to non-



appearance of the petitioner before the learned trial Court, his bail order was cancelled and bail bonds/surety bonds were forfeited to the State. Warrants of arrest were also issued against the petitioner. The reason given by the petitioner for his absence is that he has noted the wrong date. As the petitioner is keen to join the proceedings, so keeping in view the abovesaid facts, the present petition is disposed of and the impugned order dated 30.09.2025 is hereby *set aside* subject to payment of costs of Rs.10,000/- to be deposited with the Day Care Centre for Elderly Disabled Home for Old & Destitute People, Sector 15, Chandigarh by the petitioner within a period of 07 days from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. In case, the petitioner appears and surrenders before the Court concerned within a period of 10 days from the date of certified copy of this order and files an application for bail alongwith receipt of abovesaid costs, the Court concerned is directed to admit him to bail subject to its satisfaction and proceed with the trial in accordance with law. The petitioner will have protection from arrest for a period of 10 days from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

7. Needless to say that in case the petitioner fails to comply with the abovesaid direction, he will have no benefit of abovesaid protection granted by this Court and order under challenge dated 30.09.2025 would come in force and the present petition would be deemed to have been dismissed.

28.11.2025

rittu

Whether speaking/reasoned :
Whether reportable :

Yes/No
Yes/No

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE