

113 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-66951-2025

Date of Decision: 29.11.2025

MANPREET SINGH ALIAS MANNA

...Petitioner

Vs.

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. J.S. Joga, Advocate for the petitioner
(through Video Conferencing).

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 528 of BNSS for quashing of the order dated 31.07.2025 (Annexure P-4) passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Panchkula in FIR No.437, dated 24.12.2019, under Sections 397, 392, 452, 120-B, 201 IPC, and 25 of Arms Act registered at Police Station Pinjore, District Panchkula (Annexure P-1), whereby warrants of arrest has been issued against him for 19.08.2025. Now, fresh warrant of arrest has been ordered to be issued against the petitioner for 04.12.2025.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner's absence on 31.07.2025 was neither deliberate nor intentional. It is submitted that he had to travel out of station due to certain personal family exigencies. Counsel further argued that an application seeking exemption from personal appearance was duly filed, however, the same was rejected on the ground that the reasons stated therein, as well as those mentioned in the supporting affidavit, were allegedly contradictory. He submits that the petitioner is willing to appear before the Trial Court and undertakes to comply with any conditions that may be imposed. Therefore, the petition having merits for consideration and deserves to be allowed.

3. Notice of motion.

Mr. Neeraj Poswal, AAG, Haryana, having served with an advance copy, appeared on behalf of respondent-State and submits that no ground for quashing the present FIR is made out and there is no illegality and infirmity in the impugned order.

4. Heard the submissions made by counsel for the parties.

5. The petitioner did not appear before the Trial Court on 31.07.2025. Although his counsel moved an application seeking exemption from personal appearance, the same was dismissed on the ground that the reasons stated in the application were wholly inconsistent with those set out in the affidavit annexed thereto. No illegality or infirmity is apparent in the impugned order warranting interference. However, considering the petitioner's readiness and willingness to participate in the proceedings before the Trial Court, the present petition is **disposed of** with a direction to the petitioner to appear before the Trial Court on or before 04.12.2025, which is already the next date fixed, and to duly join the proceedings. There is no requirement to pass any order regarding the furnishing of bail or surety bonds, as the petitioner's bail has neither been cancelled nor have his bonds been forfeited to the State.

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

29.11.2025

kv

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No