



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No.2629 of 2026

THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

Dated : 10/02/2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE L. VICTORIA GOWRI

CRL OP(MD). No.2629 of 2026

Kumar @ Torik Kumar

... Petitioner / Accused No.3

Vs

The Inspector of Police,
Vallam Police Station,
Thanjavur District.
(Crime No.305 of 2019)

... Respondent / Complainant

PRAYER :-

To direct the Principal District and Sessions Court, Thanjavur to consider the warrant recall petition filed by the petitioner for recall the non- bailable warrant issued on 04.09.2025 against the petitioner in connection with a case in C.A.No.80/2025 which preferred against the conviction and sentence imposed by the Judicial Magistrate Warrant No. 3, Thanjavur in C.C.No.76 of 2024, on the very same day.

For Petitioner : Mr.T.Indrachithu

For Respondent : Mr.M.Sakthi Kumar
Government Advocate (Crl Side)



CRL OP(MD). No.2629 of 2026

ORDER

WEB COPY

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed to direct the Principal District and Sessions Court, Thanjavur to consider the warrant recall petition filed by the petitioner for recall the non-ailable warrant issued on 04.09.2025 against the petitioner in connection with a case in C.A.No.80/2025 which preferred against the conviction and sentence imposed by the Judicial Magistrate Warrant No.3, Thanjavur in C.C.No. 76 of 2024, on the very same day.

PROLOGUE

The criminal process is not merely a mechanism for securing convictions, but a constitutional instrument for balancing the competing imperatives of societal order, victim justice, and individual liberty. While the presence of an accused before the trial Court is indispensable for the orderly progress of criminal proceedings, coercive processes such as Non-Bailable Warrants are not intended to operate as punitive tools, divorced from the realities of human conduct and procedural contingencies.



CRL OP(MD). No.2629 of 2026

2. Equally, the inherent jurisdiction of this Court under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (corresponding to Section 482 CrPC) is extraordinary in nature and cannot be permitted to supplant or short-circuit the statutory remedies expressly provided before the trial Courts. An overzealous invocation of such jurisdiction in matters relating to recall of warrants would not only erode the authority of trial Courts but would also impede the expeditious disposal of criminal cases, thereby frustrating the mandate of Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

3. It is in the above constitutional and statutory backdrop that the present Criminal Original Petition, seeking a direction relating to recall of a Non-Bailable Warrant, falls for consideration.

GIST OF THE CASES & RELIEF SOUGHT

4. Gist of the Case:

A case in Crime No.305 of 2019 has been registered against the petitioner for the offences under Sections 457(1), 380(1) of IPC, which culminated in charge sheet in CC No.76 of 2024 before the learned Judicial Magistrate No.III, Thanjavur.



CRL OP(MD). No.2629 of 2026

WEB COPY

5. Relief Sought:

To recall the warrant issued against the petitioner by setting aside warrant dated 04.09.2025, issued by the learned Principal District and Sessions Judge, Thanjavur in C.C.No.76 of 2024.

6. Grounds urged by the petitioner:

Since the petitioner is got embroiled in his marriage process, he was not aware of the hearing dates in the aforesaid case. Only later, the petitioner came to know about the warrant issued against him.

Submissions:

7. The learned counsels for the petitioner relying upon the judgment of this Court in Crl.O.P.No.6472 of 2025 dated 07.03.2025, Crl.O.P.No.4514 of 2016 dated 02.03.2016 and similar orders, submitted that, this Court has appreciated similar cases and had allowed the same by directing the petitioner to appear before the learned trial Court and file



CRL OP(MD). No.2629 of 2026

a petition under section 70(2) of Cr.P.C,1973/ 72(2) of BNSS,2023, to recall NBW already issued against him and on filing the same the trial court has further been directed to consider the same on its own merits in accordance with law on the same day, making it clear that the disposal of the case in that manner by this Court do not amount to consider the recall petition favourably. Citing the same, the learned counsel for the petitioner sought for a similar order seeking disposition of the case in a similar manner.

8. Per contra, the learned Government Advocate categorically contended that this Court cannot invoke section 482/528 Cr.P.C/BNSS in warrant recall matters and insisted that the petitioner's remedy lies with the trial Court and on rejection by the Trial Court, before revision jurisdiction either before the sessions Court or this Court. He further submitted that this matter is already settled by this Court by Hon'ble Justice Janarthanam, J. in *P.A.Saleem and others vs State another¹* and pointed out that the said case was not brought to the attention of this Court, during disposal of Crl.O.P.No.6472 of 2025 dated 07.03.2025,

1 1994 SCC OnLine Mad 860



CRL OP(MD). No.2629 of 2026

CrI.O.P.No.4514 of 2016 dated 02.03.2016 and similar orders, by this Court and pressed for dismissal of the cases.

POINT FOR CONSIDERATION

9. Whether this Court can, in exercise of its inherent jurisdiction under Section 482 CrPC / Section 528 BNSS, directly interfere with or recall Non-Bailable Warrants issued by the trial Courts, or issue directions dispensing with personal appearance, in the teeth of the statutory remedy available before the very Court which issued the warrant, and in light of the law laid down in *P.A. Saleem*².

ANALYSIS

10. The legal position governing recall of warrants is no longer *res integra*. A Division Bench of this Court in *P.A. Saleem*³ has authoritatively examined the scheme of the Code of Criminal Procedure relating to issuance, execution and cancellation of warrants. The Court has categorically held that a warrant issued under Section 70 CrPC remains in force until it is executed or cancelled by the Court which

² Footnote 1 supra

³ Footnote 1 supra



issued it, and that the proper and primary remedy of an aggrieved accused is to approach that very Court with an application for cancellation or recall.

11. The judgment further clarifies that a refusal to cancel a warrant constitutes a final order amenable to revision under Sections 397 or 401 CrPC, and that the inherent jurisdiction under Section 482 CrPC cannot be invoked for a simpliciter recall of a warrant. The inherent power is not a substitute for statutory remedies, nor can it be employed to short-circuit the procedural hierarchy envisaged by law.

12. At the same time, ***P.A. Saleem***⁴ emphasises that trial Courts must act with promptitude and sensitivity. An accused who voluntarily appears and seeks recall of a warrant is not to be mechanically remanded; rather, the application must be considered forthwith and orders passed without delay. This approach strikes a constitutionally permissible balance between individual liberty and the collective interest in the expeditious administration of criminal justice.

⁴ Footnote 1 supra



CRL OP(MD). No.2629 of 2026

WEB COPY

13. The new criminal laws, including the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, reiterate the commitment to a justice-oriented, victim-centric and citizen-responsive system. Speedy disposal of criminal cases is not merely an administrative objective but a constitutional mandate flowing from Article 21. Endless interlocutory interventions, particularly in matters relating to warrants, have the potential to derail trials, frustrate victims, and erode public confidence in the justice delivery system.

14. In the present case, the grievances raised by the petitioner are whether founded on medical grounds, alleged lack of service, jurisdictional objections, or age and infirmity as to are all matters that can and must be placed before the respective trial Courts in applications for recall of warrants. The statutory framework expressly empowers those Courts to consider such applications and to pass appropriate orders. If such orders are adverse, the law provides for revisional scrutiny.



CRL OP(MD). No.2629 of 2026

15. In view of the binding dictum laid down in ***P.A. Saleem***⁵ and the Common Judgment of this Court in CrI.O.P.(MD) Nos.21580, 22630, 22033 & 22808 of 2025, this Criminal Original Petition is not maintainable for the relief sought. As far as the orders passed by this Court in CrI.O.P. No. 6742 of 2025 and other similar orders, this Court finds that the dictum in P.A. Saleem and other cases has been left unnoticed.

16. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is disposed of, with the following clarifications:

(a) The petitioner is directed to approach the learned Principal District and Sessions Judge, Thanjavur, by filing an appropriate application under Section 72(2) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, seeking recall or cancellation of the Non-Bailable Warrant dated 04.09.2025.

(b) Upon such application being filed, the learned trial Court shall consider and dispose of the same expeditiously, preferably on the same

⁵ Footnote 1 supra



CRL OP(MD). No.2629 of 2026

day, in accordance with law, without adopting a mechanical or punitive approach.

(c) In the event of any adverse order, it shall be open to the petitioner to avail the revisional remedies provided under law.

(d) The learned trial Court is also reminded of its obligation to ensure expeditious conduct of the trial, consistent with the mandate of Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

10.02.2026

NCC : Yes/No
Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No

pnn



CRL OP(MD). No.2629 of 2026

WEB COPY

To

- 1.The Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Thanjavur.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
Vallam Police Station,
Thanjavur District.
- 3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No.2629 of 2026

L. VICTORIA GOWRI,J

pnn

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.2629 of 2026

Date : 10/02/2026