



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

159

CRM-M-70522-2025
Decided on : 15.01.2026

Latif
Versus
State of Haryana
... Petitioner(s)
... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Saleem Ahmed, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Instant petition, under Section 528 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 482 Cr.P.C.), has been filed for quashing of the order dated 29.10.2025 (Annexure P-4), passed by Ld. Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Nuh, whereby after cancelling the bail of the petitioner, warrants of arrest have been issued against him, in case, i.e., CHI-586-2023, dated 20.07.2023 (CNR No.hrnu030040062023), titled as, “State v. Anish Etc.”,on account of his non-appearance in the following FIR:-

FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
338	30.12.2021	419, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of IPC	City Nuh	Nuh

2. Counsel for the petitioner contends that at the first instance petitioner – Latif, was granted concession of pre-arrest bail by the court of Sessions, i.e., learned Additional Sessions Judge, Nuh, vide order dated 27.07.2022 (P-2) and thereupon, said interim bail order was confirmed on

joining the investigation on dated 23.08.2022 (P-3). Petitioner was regularly appearing as and when proceeding of the case were fixed before the Court below. However, only on one occasion, i.e., 29.10.2025 (P-4), petitioner committed fault and could not appear before the Court below. Resultantly, his bail was cancelled and bail bonds were forfeited to State. His presence was ordered to be secured through warrants of arrest.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that due to noting down of wrong date, petitioner failed to appear before the Court below on 29.10.2025, and thus, remained absent on the said date.

Further submits that after coming to know of the lapse and consequences, petitioner has immediately approached this Court by way of filing present petition. Thus, submits that absence of the petitioner was neither intentional nor deliberate, but he defaulted due to the reasons, mentioned here-above.

4. Learned Counsel further submits that now petitioner is ready to join the process of law, however, he be directed to be released on bail, on his surrendering before the Court and thus, be protected from arrest. In case, one opportunity is granted, petitioner also undertakes that he would not absent himself in future, without there being prior permission from the Court, and fully cooperate for early disposal of the trial.

5. Notice of motion.

6. Learned State counsel puts an appearance, and opposes the request of the petitioner by submitting that petitioner does not deserve any sympathy, because, he has misused the concession of bail granted by the Court. Learned State counsel by pointing out the irresponsible conduct of the petitioner, submits that there is every possibility that for the purpose of

delaying the trial, he would again be absenting during the proceedings.

7. In number of cases, this Court has been experiencing the situation wherein, accused stopped appearing before trial Court in the criminal cases after being released on bail and thereby compelling the Court to issue non-bailable warrants by cancelling the bail already granted or such accused has been declared 'Proclaimed Person'/Proclaimed Offender'. After examining the facts from several cases, this Court has formulated and applied a uniform method by satisfying itself that such accused would appear before the concerned Court, to enable it to proceed further, instead of delaying the proceedings to await the presence of accused.

Intentional or unintentional default of the accused can be dealt with by examining the facts from case to case in which he is involved, and where it is realised that absence or prolonged absence of such accused is intentional to evade the process of law, he/she can be penalized after examining the nature of crime in which he is facing the proceedings and thereupon by imposing some cost amount subject to his/her capacity to pay.

Primary object of every Court is only to examine the commission of crime in question before it *vis a vis* the person/accused, who is subjected to such proceedings, and if possible justice be imparted at the earliest without unnecessary delay. It is not expected that undue time would be devoted in securing the presence of absconded accused and also to waste energy by enforcing the special mechanism to arrest such accused.

Considering all such aspects, this Court in the case of ***Ashish Kumar Honda @ Ashish Handa Vs. State of Punjab, 2022 (4) RCR (criminal) 765; Law Finder Doc Id # 20238111*** considered similar plea of appearance, expressed at the instance of the accused, who failed to appear

before the Court at appropriate time, and observed that:

“paramount consideration of the Court is to secure presence of accused on each and every date for speeding up the trial for its final conclusion. Already Courts are flooded with so much litigation, resulting in slow pace of work, because of more than one reason. The required energy and manpower be used for expediting the proceedings of the Court, instead of running after the accused persons to get hold of them.”

Again, this Court has considered the aforementioned similar plea in case *Veena @ Veena Devi v. State of Punjab (CRM-M-2206-2025, decided on 16.01.2025.*

8. I have considered the submissions of both the sides and examined the relevant material available on record. The petitioner has remiss in appearing before the Court only on one date, and consequently, on 29.10.2025, when impugned order cancelling the bail and issuance of warrants of arrest, has been passed against him. It also cannot be left unnoticed that within three months of the absence from the Court, and on coming to know about passing of the impugned order, the petitioner has moved the present petition, showing his inclination to submit himself before the trial Court.

9. In totality of circumstances, I am of the view that the petitioner can be given one chance to appear before the trial Court, so that proceedings may restart and continue in smooth manner. Accordingly, plea of the petitioner is accepted. Impugned order dated 29.10.2025 (P-4) is **set aside** to the extent of issuance of warrants against the petitioner, and he is directed to be released on bail, in the eventuality of surrender by him before the trial Court on or before **31.01.2026**.

The petitioner shall also furnish fresh bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court, in case the bail bonds have already been

forfeited. Besides, petitioner would also submit specific undertaking/affidavit that he will keep appearing during the proceedings of the trial in future and the proceedings would not be delayed because of his conduct.

10. **With aforementioned terms, present petition stands disposed of.**

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

January 15, 2026

J.Ram

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