

CRM-M-31805-2025

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

CRM-M-31805-2025
Reserved on: 10.07.2025
Pronounced on: 29.07.2025

Varinder Singh ...Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and another ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Arshdeep Singh Brar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Navreet Kaur Barnala, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Brijeshwar Singh Bhalla, Advocate
for the complainant.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
220	25.10.2023	City South Moga, District Moga	420, 120B IPC

1. Seeking cancellation of anticipatory bail granted to respondent No.2, complainant (petitioner herein) has come up before this Court by filing the present petition under Section 483 (3) of BNSS 2023.

2. Petitioner's counsel seeks cancellation of bail on the ground that the accused had mislead the Courts as well as the complainant and on false pretext, had obtained bail. Counsel for the petitioner further submits that after grant of bail by this Court, respondent travel abroad without the permission of the Court, which is a violation of the order of this Court, as condition was there to the effect that he shall not leave the country without permission of the Court.

3. On the other hand, counsel for the accused-respondent No.2 submits that in the cheque case which relates to the same matter, the accused-respondent No.2 stands convicted and now he is appearing before the trial Court on each and every date. Counsel for respondent No.2 submits that petitioner is in India and if he gone out of country without permission, certainly the trial Court have power to cancel his bail and complainant never brought this fact into the notice of the Court.

4. Counsel for the State has referred to the pleadings and supported stand of the prosecution.

CRM-M-31805-2025

5. Vide impugned order dated 07.11.2023, the Additional Sessions Judge, Moga had granted bail to the accused-respondent No.2

6. I have gone through the record and heard the rival contentions of both the parties. Perusal of the order reflects that he was granted bail subject to compliance of condition as envisaged in Section 438(2) CrPC, however there is no specific direction to travel abroad with prior permission. Petitioner filed this petition on 02.06.2025, however respondent was present on 08.07.2024 before the Court of JMIC, Moga, if respondent No.2 was gone abroad without permission of the Court, in that case he has liberty to bring the fact to the notice of Court. There is no date mentioned on which the respondent No.2 was not present before the trial Court in the above captioned FIR.

7. Given the discussion above, it is not a case to cancel the bail granted to respondent No.2, as such, petition dismissed. Pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

29.07.2025
anju rani

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No.