



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

130

CRM-M-47993-2025

Date of Decision : 29.08.2025

LOVEPREET SINGH

...Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE AARADHNA SAWHNEY

Present: Ms. Deepali Jindal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gautam Thapar, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

AARADHNA SAWHNEY, J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioner, a co-accused in case FIR No. 63 dated 21.06.2023 registered against him for commission of offences punishable u/s 542, 379-B, 323, 148, 149 IPC at Police Station Kot Bhai, District Sri Muktsar Sahib, has prayed for quashing of order dated 30.04.2025 (Annexure P-4) passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sri Muktsar Sahib, vide which his bail was cancelled, bail bonds/surety bonds were forfeited to the State, his presence was sought to be procured through non-bailable warrants and notice was issued to the surety. In terms of order dated 22.07.2025 (Annexure P-5), since non-bailable warrants issued to procure presence of petitioner were received back unexecuted, fresh non-bailable warrants were issued for 16.10.2025, surety, who did not appear in the Court despite service, was summoned through bailable warrants, for the said day.
2. Learned counsel submits that after the registration of the FIR, petitioner was granted the concession of bail by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court on 21.08.2023. Thereafter, petitioner was continuously appearing before trial Court on each and every date. On 30.01.2025, petitioner moved an application



seeking exemption from appearing in the trial Court. The said application was allowed and the case was adjourned for 30.04.2025. However, petitioner could not appear before the trial Court on the said day, as he was falsely implicated in another criminal case bearing FIR No.85 dated 22.07.2024, u/s 304, 115(2), 127(1), 190, 191(3) of BNS, registered at Police Station Gidderbaha, District Sri Muktsar Sahib.

Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that learned trial Court hastily proceeded to cancel the bail of the accused-petitioner, who did not intentionally remained absent, but being in custody in some other case could not put in his appearance. With this backdrop, learned counsel submits to take a lenient view in favour of the present petitioner, who undertakes to appear before the trial Court on the date fixed.

3. Heard. Though it was duty of the petitioner to inform his counsel as also the Court about the lodging of another FIR against him as also that on account the aforesaid reason, he would not be able to appear before the Court on the day fixed. But without prolonging the trial much further, interest of justice would be served, if petitioner is directed to appear before the Court concerned on or before 16.10.2025. On his appearance, if he moves an application for grant of bail, the same shall be decided expeditiously by the learned trial Court preferably within 2 days, after giving notice to the complainant.

Accordingly, the present petition stands disposed of.

(AARADHNA SAWHNEY)
JUDGE

29.08.2025

Nisha Yadav

Whether Speaking/reasoned *Yes/No*
Whether Reportable *Yes/No*