



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

(169)

CRM-M-10766-2026

DATE OF DECISION: 11.03.2026

Maninder Kaur

.....Petitioner

Versus

Stae of Punjab and another

.....Respondents

CORAM HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present Mr.H.S.Jugait, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr.Surinderjit Singh Nahar, AAG, Punjab.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 528 of the BNSS, 2023 for partial quashing of order dated 19.08.2025 (Annexure P-1) and order dated 29.09.2025 (Annexure P-2), passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar, Punjab, in CRA-208-2025, arising out of complaint No. NACT/2368/2020 dated 17.08.2020, titled Radhey Shyam Arora v. Maninder Kaur, whereby application for suspension of sentence of the petitioner was allowed, subject to deposit of 20% of the cheque / compensation amount and subsequently bail granted to the petitioner was cancelled, due to non deposit of 20% of the cheque / compensation amount and also by absenting her from the Court, vide order dated 29.09.2025.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner had pleaded exceptional financial hardship before the Appellate Court that she is a single mother and sole earning member for maintaining three school going minor children but despite that learned Appellate Court had mechanically imposed the condition of deposit without recording any reasons or considering the discretionary power available under law. Hence, prayer for quashing the impugned orders is made.



CRM-M-10766-2026 2

3. Notice of motion.

4. In pursuance of advance notice, Mr.Surinderjit Singh Nahar, AAG, Punjab, appeared on behalf of respondent no.1 / State and submitted that learned Appellate Court while dismissing the application for suspension of sentence of the petitioner, had directed the petitioner to appear before the learned trial Court within 15 days but despite that neither the petitioner had appeared before the learned trial Court nor deposited 20% of the cheque/compensation amount.

5. Heard.

6. Keeping in view the contentions made by learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel, this Court is of the view that despite the directions issued vide order dated 19.08.2025 by the learned Appellate Court to the petitioner to appear before the learned trial Court within a period of two weeks, the petitioner neither appeared nor took any steps to move an application for modification of the order dated 19.08.2025. She remained absent even on 29.09.2025 before the learned Appellate Court, which resulted in cancellation of her bail. Thereafter, the learned Appellate Court adjourned the case to 18.12.2025. Moreover, learned counsel for the petitioner has failed to produce copy of any further zimni order showing further proceedings in the Court, to show her bona fides, which shows that he is concealing facts from the Court.

7. In view of the above, the act and conduct of the petitioner does not entitle her to any relief from this Court.

8. Accordingly, the present petition stands dismissed.

11.03.2026
mamta

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

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