



119 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-32865-2026
Date of Decision : 09.06.2026

Rajpreet Singh @ Maan Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NEERJA K. KALSON

Present: Mr. Ravinder Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Adhiraj Singh, AAG, Punjab.

NEERJA K. KALSON, J. (ORAL)

1. Second petition has been filed under Section 528 of the Bhartiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita seeking quashing of orders dated 15.12.2025 (Annexure P-4), 10.02.2026 (Annexure P-7), 07.03.2026 (Annexure P-8) and 01.04.2026 (Annexure P-11) passed by the learned trial court in case FIR no.0096 dated 12.07.2025 registered under Sections 333, 324 (4), 351 (2) of the BNS, 2023 (corresponding Sections 452, 427, 506 IPC) at Police Station Kotbhai, District Sri Muktsar Sahib. First petition filed by the petitioner was disposed of by a Coordinate Bench vide order dated 23.01.2026 with a direction to petitioner to surrender before the learned trial Court on or before 07.02.2026. The petitioner appeared before the trial Court, however was unable to produce any surety and thus fresh bail bonds of the petitioner could not be submitted.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was granted the concession of pre-arrest bail by the learned trial Court vide order dated 12.08.2025. He further submits that pursuant to the investigation, challan was presented against the petitioner in his absence as the petitioner was not

aware of the same. It is contended that the petitioner did not receive any summons from the learned trial Court requiring his appearance in the present case and that the counsel engaged by him had informed him that he would be required to appear before the learned trial Court upon receipt of summons. Consequently, the petitioner remained under the bona fide impression that his appearance was not yet required. It is further submitted that upon learning that the police had started raiding his residence, the petitioner contacted his counsel, who, upon checking the status of the case, informed him that vide order dated 15.12.2025, the learned trial Court had issued non-bailable warrants against him for 27.01.2026. It is thus submitted that the petitioner's non-appearance was neither wilful nor intentional but occurred on account of the aforesaid bona fide circumstances.

3. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner thereafter approached this Court by filing CRM-M-3756-2026 titled "Rajpreet Singh @ Maan Singh versus State of Punjab" seeking quashing of the order dated 15.12.2025. Vide order dated 23.01.2026, this Court was pleased to allow the petition. In compliance thereof, the petitioner appeared before the learned trial Court on 07.02.2026. However, on the said date, the petitioner was unable to arrange a surety and consequently could not furnish fresh bail bonds, as a result whereof he was not permitted to surrender before the learned trial Court. It is submitted that while the petitioner was taking steps to arrange the requisite surety, the learned trial Court again issued non-bailable warrants against him on 10.02.2026 and thereafter on 07.03.2026.

4. It is further submitted that in the meantime, another FIR came to be registered against the petitioner and, apprehending his arrest therein, the petitioner was unable to appear before the learned trial Court on 01.04.2026. Consequently, the learned trial Court again issued non-bailable warrants against

him vide order dated 01.04.2026. Thereafter, vide order dated 24.04.2026, the learned trial Court ordered that the petitioner be summoned by way of proclamation under Section 84 of the BNSS, 2023, on the ground that he had not surrendered and furnished fresh bail bonds.

5. Learned counsel submits that the petitioner's inability to appear and furnish fresh bail bonds was on account of circumstances beyond his control, namely his inability to arrange surety and the apprehension of arrest in the aforesaid FIR. It is further submitted that the petitioner is now ready and willing to furnish surety to the satisfaction of the Court, shall join the trial as and when required, shall not flee from justice or tamper with the prosecution evidence, and undertakes to abide by all terms and conditions that may be imposed by this Hon'ble Court.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and have perused the record.

7. The record reveals that the petitioner was granted the concession of anticipatory bail at the initial stage of the proceedings. It is also not disputed that after issuance of non-bailable warrants, the petitioner had approached this Court and obtained relief. Pursuant thereto, he appeared before the learned trial Court. The subsequent orders impugned herein appear to have been passed primarily on account of non-furnishing of fresh bail bonds and surety rather than on account of any overt act demonstrating a deliberate attempt on the part of the petitioner to evade the process of law.

8. The purpose of issuance of non-bailable warrants is to secure the presence of an accused before the Court and not to visit him with penal consequences where his presence can otherwise be ensured. In the facts of the present case, particularly keeping in view the earlier grant of anticipatory bail, the appearance of the petitioner before the trial Court pursuant to the directions

issued by this Court and the nature of the default alleged against him, this Court is of the considered view that the interest of justice would be adequately served by affording the petitioner one final opportunity to regularize his appearance before the learned trial Court.

9. Consequently, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, orders dated 15.12.2025 (Annexure P-4), 10.02.2026 (Annexure P-7), 07.03.2026 (Annexure P-8) and 01.04.2026 (Annexure P-11) are set aside, subject to the petitioner depositing costs of 20,000/- with the High Court Lawyers' Welfare Fund, Chandigarh, within a period of two weeks from today.

10. The petitioner shall appear before the learned trial Court within a period of fifteen days from today or on the next date fixed, whichever is earlier, and shall furnish requisite bail bonds/surety bonds to its satisfaction. The petitioner shall thereafter remain bound by the conditions already imposed and shall participate in the proceedings regularly.

11. It is made clear that in the event of any future default without sufficient cause, the learned trial Court shall be at liberty to proceed against the petitioner in accordance with law.

12. Petition stands disposed of accordingly.

13. It is clarified that if the costs, as directed above, are not deposited within the stipulated period, the benefit of the present order shall automatically stand withdrawn.

(NEERJA K. KALSON)
JUDGE

June 09, 2026

ps

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