

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

2026:PHHC:068347



(152)

CRM-M-24548-2026

Date of Decision: 04.05.2026

Aman

--Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

--Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ.

Present:- Mr. S.K. Yadav, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sumit Jain, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ.J (Oral)

1. Prayer in the present petition is for setting aside of the impugned order dated 10.04.2026, passed by learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Ambala, whereby, bail of the petitioner has been cancelled and bail bonds have been forfeited to the State in case FIR No.231 dated 02.06.2024 registered under section 379-A IPC (corresponding Section 304 of BNS, 2023) registered at Police Station Mahesh Nagar, District Ambala and impugned order dated 27.04.2026 vide which the surety of the petitioner has undertaken to produce him before the court.

2. It has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He submits that the petitioner were regularly appearing before the trial Court, however, on 10.04.2026, he could not appear before the court due to employment constraints as he is working as a cleaner and had gone to Kolkata for his livelihood. On his instructions, his counsel had moved an application seeking his exemption before the court concerned, however, the same was

dismissed vide order dated 10.04.2026 and bail of the petitioner was cancelled. Counsel submits that absence of the petitioner was totally unintentional and due to the circumstances beyond his control. He further submits that the petitioner is ready to appear before the trial Court and abide by all the terms and conditions, if any imposed by this Court.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. Sumit Jain, Addl. A.G., Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the State and has opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that learned trial Court has rightly cancelled the bail of the petitioner, as he intentionally did not appear before it, on the date fixed.

5. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is evident that due to non-appearance of the petitioner, bail of the petitioner has been cancelled vide order dated 10.04.2026 and vide order dated 27.04.2026 surety of the petitioner has been undertaken to produce the petitioner before the court concerned.

6. This Court without going into the authenticity of the ground taken for the absence of the petitioner, deems it appropriate to direct the petitioner to appear before the Court concerned and to face the trial in the present case. In these circumstances, when the petitioner is ready to join the trial and face the proceedings, the orders dated 10.04.2026 and 27.04.2026, are set aside.

7. The petitioner is directed to appear before the trial Court within a period of ten days from the date of receipt of copy of this order and file an appropriate application and the trial Court would grant him bail till the disposal of the case on his furnishing fresh bail/surety bonds. The

petitioner will have protection from arrest for a period of ten days from the date of receipt of copy of this order. The trial Court is free to impose any condition it likes on the petitioner while admitting him to bail.

8. Needless to say that in case the petitioner fails to comply with the above said direction, this order would be of no avail to them and the orders dated 10.04.2026 and 27.04.2026 will come in force and the present petition shall be deemed to have been dismissed.

9. Petition stands disposed of in above said terms.

04.05.2026
lucky

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable:	Yes/No