

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT

CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-42669-2014

Date of Decision: August 17, 2015

Sukhdev Singh and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NARESH KUMAR SANGHI

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

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 petitioners were declared as proclaimed offenders.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that it is a case of version and cross-version; the petitioners were not aware that they were required in the present case; and that without there being cogent reasons, the petitioners have been declared as proclaimed offenders.

On the other hand, learned counsel for the State, assisted by counsel for the informant, submits that the petitioners had moved a petition for grant of anticipatory bail before Court of Session and the same was rejected on 7.2.2014, therefore, it does not lie in the mouth of the petitioners to say that they were not aware regarding the criminal case pending against them. He further submits that anticipatory bail petition filed by the petitioners was also dismissed by this Court. He further submits that the persons who have no respect for law, should not be granted the relief of setting aside of the order of proclamation or grant of bail.

After hearing learned counsel for the parties and going through the material available on record, this Court finds that FIR No. 69 was registered on 3.7.2011 and thereafter for next three years the petitioners were evading their arrest. Their petition for anticipatory bail was rejected by Court of Session on 7.2.2014 and, as such, it cannot be said that they were not aware of the pendency

of the criminal case against them. There is no infirmity in the impugned order dated 27.10.2014, passed by learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Tarn Taran, declaring them as proclaimed offenders.

Dismissed.

(NARESH KUMAR SANGHI)
JUDGE

August 17, 2015
Pkapoor