



144

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

**CRM-M No.69494 of 2025
Date of Decision:10.12.2025**

Parminder Singh**..... Petitioner****Versus****State of Haryana****..... Respondent****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ**

Present: Mr. Deepak Aggarwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed praying for quashing of order dated 09.05.2024 passed by learned JMIC, Ambala vide which non-bailable warrants of arrest have been issued against the petitioner in case FIR No.227 dated 11.11.2019 under Section 3 of Public Property (Prevention of Damage) Act, 1985, registered at Police Station Sadar Ambala, District Ambala. Further prayer has been made for staying the operation of order dated 09.05.2024, during the pendency of the present petition.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner was prosecuted in the case FIR No.227 dated 11.11.2019 under Section 3 of Public Property (Prevention of Damage) Act, 1985, registered at Police Station Sadar Ambala, District Ambala. He submits that the petitioner was regularly appearing before the learned trial Court,



however, on 09.05.2024, he could not arrange the surety and thus, he remained absent from trial Court. He has submitted that due to the absence of petitioner, the learned trial Court vide order dated 09.05.2024 issued the non-bailable warrants against the petitioner for 31.08.2024. He has submitted that absence of the petitioner was *bona fide* and not intentional and he never misused the concession of bail granted to him. 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, Mr. Sumit Jain, Addl. A.G., Haryana appears and accepts notice on behalf of the respondents-State. He on the other hand has contended that the non bailable warrants were rightly issued against the petitioner and he was liable to be prosecuted in the said case, 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 the present case. Non-bailable warrants were also issued against the petitioner vide order dated 09.05.2024. But now the petitioner is keen and ready to join the proceedings and face the trial. So keeping in view the abovesaid facts, the present petition is disposed of and the order dated 09.05.2024 is *set aside* subject to payment of Rs.10,000/- as costs to be deposited in the **‘Day Care Centre for Elderly Disabled in home for old & Destitute People, Sector-15 Chandigarh’** by the petitioner in one week from the date of receipt of copy of this order. In case, petitioner



appears before the Court concerned within a period of 10 days from the date of receipt of 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. He will have protection from arrest for a period of 10 days from the date of receipt of 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 09.05.2024 would automatically come in force.

10.12.2025
ps-I

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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