

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT

CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-40329-2014

Date of Decision: August 17, 2015

Joga Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NARESH KUMAR SANGHI**

Present: Mr. Amit Arora, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

Mr. K.S. Pannu, DAG, Punjab,  
for the respondent.

Mr. Vikas Gupta, Advocate,  
for the informant.

1. *Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?*
2. *To be referred to the Reporters or not?*
3. *Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?*

**NARESH KUMAR SANGHI, J (Oral)**

Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482, Cr.P.C., is  
for quashing of the order dated 27.10.2014 (Annexure P-6), passed  
by learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Tarn Tarn,

whereby the petitioner has been declared as a proclaimed offender.

Learned counsel contends that vide order dated 28.8.2014 (Annexure P-5), passed by this Court, the petitioner was granted ad-interim bail and thereafter he joined the investigation on 18.11.2014 and, as such, the impugned order dated 27.10.2014 (Annexure P-6), passed by learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Tarn Taran, declaring the petitioner as a proclaimed offender, be set aside.

On the other hand, learned counsel for the State, assisted by counsel for the informant, submits that without disclosing the fact that the petitioner was declared as a proclaimed offender by learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Tarn Taran, on 27.10.2014, he (petitioner) joined the investigation. He further submits that the said fact was not even disclosed before this Court. He further points out that FIR No. 69 was registered on 3.7.2011 and for the last more than three years the petitioner was evading his arrest. He further points out that the petitioner moved an application for grant of anticipatory bail before learned Court of Session which was declined on 7.2.2014 and, as such, it was in his (petitioner) knowledge that he was required in the present case.

After hearing learned counsel for the parties and going

through the material available on record, this Court finds that the petitioner has evaded his arrest for the last more than three years. He has been attributed the injury attracting the mischief of Section 326, IPC. It is the consistent law that no indulgence should be shown to a person who has no respect for the law. There is no infirmity in the impugned order dated 27.10.2014, passed by learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Tarn Taran, declaring the petitioner as a proclaimed offender.

Dismissed.

**(NARESH KUMAR SANGHI)**  
**JUDGE**

**August 17, 2015**  
Pkapoor