



CRM-M-3790-2026

1

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

Sr. No.215

CRM-M-3790-2026

Date of Decision: 10.03.2026

LUBHAYA ALIAS LADDI

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU

Present:- Mr. Vipan Kumar Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

MANDEEP PANNU, J. (Oral)

1. This is the first petition under Section 483 of the BNSS, 2023 (akin to Section 439 Cr.P.C.) seeking grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 124 dated 21.08.2019, registered under Sections 307, 324, 323, 148 and 149 of the IPC at Police Station Division No. 5, Jalandhar, District Jalandhar.

2. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner was earlier granted the concession of regular bail during the course of trial. However, thereafter he could not appear before the learned trial Court on certain dates and consequently he was declared a proclaimed offender. It is further submitted that subsequently the petitioner moved an application for regular bail and he was again granted regular bail vide order dated 27.11.2019. Learned counsel submits that thereafter the petitioner again remained absent from the proceedings on 25.09.2023, whereupon his bail was cancelled and he was again declared a proclaimed offender vide order dated 20.04.2024. It is further submitted that the petitioner has now



been arrested on 12.09.2025 and is in judicial custody since then. It is argued that the petitioner had moved a bail application before the learned Additional Sessions Judge, which came to be dismissed vide order dated 17.12.2025. Learned counsel submits that the trial of the case is likely to take time and the continued incarceration of the petitioner would amount to pre-trial punishment. It is further submitted that the petitioner undertakes to appear before the trial Court on each and every date of hearing and shall not misuse the concession of bail. On these grounds, prayer has been made for grant of regular bail.

3. Notice of motion.

4. On the asking of the Court, Mr. Hardeep Hans, AAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the respondent–State and opposes the present bail application on the ground that the petitioner has misused the concession of bail twice in the present case. It is submitted that the petitioner had earlier been granted bail but he jumped bail and absented himself from the proceedings, as a result of which he was declared a proclaimed offender. Even after being granted bail again, the petitioner once again failed to appear before the trial Court and was declared a proclaimed offender for the second time. It is contended that the conduct of the petitioner clearly shows that he has flouted the orders of the Court and has no respect for the judicial process, and therefore he does not deserve the concession of bail.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record. The conduct of the petitioner shows that he has repeatedly misused the concession of bail granted to him by the Court. The record reveals that the petitioner was earlier granted bail during the trial but



CRM-M-3790-2026

3

he failed to appear before the trial Court and was declared a proclaimed offender. Thereafter, even after being granted bail again vide order dated 27.11.2019, the petitioner once again remained absent from the proceedings and was declared a proclaimed offender vide order dated 20.04.2024. Thus, the petitioner has twice jumped bail and has twice been declared a proclaimed offender in the present case.

6. Such conduct of the petitioner clearly demonstrates that he has little regard for the orders passed by the Court and the due process of law. The repeated violation of the bail conditions by the petitioner indicates that there is a strong likelihood that he may again abscond and evade the process of law if the concession of bail is granted to him. The Court cannot overlook the fact that the petitioner has already been given opportunities in the past but he has failed to honour the trust reposed in him by the Court.

7. In view of the aforesaid circumstances, particularly the fact that the petitioner has misused the concession of bail on more than one occasion and has been declared a proclaimed offender twice, this Court does not find it to be a fit case for grant of the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.

9. However, nothing observed herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

10. All pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

10.03.2026

Anu

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