


CRM-M-26718-2026
Date of decision: 12.05.2026

...PETITIONER

...RESPONDENTS

1. This petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short - 'the BNSS'), seeking quashing of orders dated 22.09.2023 (Annexure P-2) and 30.01.2026 (Annexure P-3) passed by learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Karnal, whereby, bail of the petitioner was cancelled and his arrest warrants were issued and proclamation was issued against the petitioner, respectively, in case bearing FIR No.306 dated 06.07.2022, under Sections 279, 307, 336, 34 and 353 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Section 25 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station Taraori, District Karnal and further prayer is for exemption from personal appearance of the petitioner before the trial court till December, 2026, with permission to be represented through counsel of the petitioner.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that due to some unavoidable circumstances, the petitioner had to leave the country; thereafter, he could not maintain regular communication with his counsel and could not appear before the trial court. Subsequently, bail of the petitioner was cancelled and proclamation was issued against him. Absence of the petitioner before the trial court was not intentional or deliberate. Learned counsel further submitted



that the petitioner is ready to surrender before the trial court and prayed that till then, he may not be arrested by the police.

3. Notice of motion.
4. Mr. Surender Singh Pannu, Addl. A.G., Haryana, who is present in Court, accepted notice on behalf of respondent-State and opposed the present petition by submitting that the petitioner was fully aware about the proceedings pending before the trial court qua him and did not put in appearance before the trial court intentionally, due to which, impugned orders were passed. He further contended that the bail of the petitioner was cancelled two years ago i.e. in the year 2023, and now, when the proclamation proceedings have been initiated against him, he approached this Court.
5. Heard.
6. This Court has considered the contentions of learned counsel for the parties and perused the impugned orders of trial court and found that the trial court has not committed any error or irregularity while passing the impugned orders, despite having knowledge about the pending proceedings before the trial court, the petitioner went abroad without any prior permission or intimation to the concerned trial court. He did not appear before the trial court intentionally, resultantly, his bail was cancelled and proclamation proceedings have been initiated against him.
7. In view of the above, this Court finds no merit in the present petition and the same stands dismissed.

May 12, 2026
Manisha

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

(i)	Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
(ii)	Whether reportable	Yes/No