

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

129

CRM-M-14770-2021

Date of decision: 28.04.2021

Dilpreet Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR TYAGI

Present : Mr. Bipin Ghai, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Deepanshu Mehta, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. P.S. Walia, Asstt. A.G. Punjab
for the respondent-State.

ARUN KUMAR TYAGI, J (ORAL)

(The case has been taken up for hearing through video conferencing.)

Petitioner-**Dilpreet Singh** has filed present petition under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (for short 'the Cr.P.C.') for quashing of order dated 05.11.2020 passed by learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, Moga in case FIR No.69 dated 12.07.2020 registered under Section 306 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short 'the IPC') in Police Station Kot Ise Khan, District Moga, whereby the petitioner was declared proclaimed person under Section 82 of the Cr.P.C., and all consequential proceedings arising out of the same and order dated 04.03.2021 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Moga dismissing revision against the above-said order.

Briefly stated the facts relevant for disposal of present petition are that the above-said FIR was registered on complaint of Amarjit Singh, brother-in-law of Dilpreet Singh (the petitioner). In his complaint, Amarjit Singh has alleged that they solemnized second marriage of his sister-Randeep Kaur, who was divorcee, with the petitioner on 24.03.2019. After marriage the petitioner and his family

members taunted his sister for being divorcee. Due to which she went back to her parental house. Panchayats convened by the relatives were of no effect on which applications were given by both the parties. On application moved by the petitioner side, they were called in Police Post Chautala. When they along with Randeep Kaur went there, the petitioner and his relatives made serious allegations regarding her character and stated that it was better if she died. After returned from the police post his sister remained depressed and on being asked told them that her in-laws used to harass and demand dowry articles and now they have started levelling false allegations regarding her character due to which she is not in a position to face anybody. They tried to prevail upon her but she committed suicide on 12.07.2020.

When the case was at the stage of investigation, on failure of the petitioner to appear before the Court despite publication of proclamation, the petitioner was declared proclaimed person by learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, Moga vide order dated 05.11.2020. The petitioner filed revision petition against the above-said order which was dismissed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Moga vide order dated 04.03.2021.

Feeling aggrieved from the above-said orders the petitioner has filed the present petition for quashing of the above-said orders along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom.

I have heard learned Counsel for the petitioner and learned State Counsel and have gone through the record.

Learned Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner was wrongly declared proclaimed person by learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, Moga vide order dated 05.11.2020 in breach of the prescribed procedure. The petitioner was not given 30 days time for his appearance before the Court. The revision filed by the petitioner was wrongly dismissed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Moga. The impugned orders suffer from material illegality and may be quashed with all subsequent proceedings arising out of the same.

On the other hand, learned State Counsel has submitted that the petitioner absconded and was rightly declared proclaimed

person vide order dated 05.11.2020 after expiry of the period of 30 days from publication of the proclamation. The impugned orders do not suffer from any illegality and the petition may be dismissed.

On consideration of the submissions made by learned Counsel for the petitioner and learned State Counsel and on perusal of the relevant record, I am of the considered view that the impugned orders dated 05.11.2020 and 04.03.2021 suffer from material illegality and are liable to be quashed with all subsequent proceedings arising out of the same.

Section 82 of the Cr.P.C., which provides for publication of proclamation against person absconding, reads as under:-

“82. Proclamation for person absconding.—

*(1) If any Court has reason to believe (whether after taking evidence or not) that any person against whom a warrant has been issued by it has absconded or is concealing himself so that such warrant cannot be executed, such Court may publish a written proclamation **requiring him to appear at a specified place and at a specified time not less than thirty days from the date of publishing such proclamation.***

(2) The proclamation shall be published as follows:—

(i) (a) it shall be publicly read in some conspicuous place of the town or village in which such person ordinarily resides;

(b) it shall be affixed to some conspicuous part of the house or homestead in which such person ordinarily resides or to some conspicuous place of such town or village;

(c) a copy thereof shall be affixed to some conspicuous part of the Court-house;

(ii) the Court may also, if it thinks fit, direct a copy of the proclamation to be published in a daily newspaper circulating in the place in which such person ordinarily resides.

(3) A statement in writing by the Court issuing the proclamation to the effect that the proclamation was duly published on a specified day, in the manner specified in clause (i) of sub-section (2), shall be conclusive evidence that the requirements of this section have been complied with, and that the proclamation was published on such day.

(4) Where a proclamation published under sub-section (1) is in respect of a person accused of an offence punishable

under section 302, 304, 364, 367, 382, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 402, 436, 449, 459 or 460 of the Indian Penal Code (45 of 1860), and such person fails to appear at the specified place and time required by the proclamation, the Court may, after making such inquiry as it thinks fit, pronounce him a proclaimed offender and make a declaration to that effect.

(5) The provisions of sub-sections (2) and (3) shall apply to a declaration made by the Court under sub-section (4) as they apply to the proclamation published under sub-section (1)."

The essential requirements of Section 82 of the Cr.P.C. for issuance and publication of proclamation against an absconder and declaring him as proclaimed person/offender may be summarized as under:-

- (i) Prior issuance of warrant of arrest by the Court is *sine qua non* for issuance and publication of the proclamation and the Court has to first issue warrant of arrest against the person concerned. (See ***Rohit Kumar Vs. State of Delhi : 2008 CrL J. 2561***).
- (ii) There must be a report before the Court that the person against whom warrant was issued had absconded or had been concealing himself so that the warrant of arrest could not be executed against him. However, the Court is not bound to take evidence in this regard before issuing a Proclamation under Section 82 (1) of the Cr.P.C.. (See ***Rohit Kumar Vs. State of Delhi : 2008 CrL J. 2561***).
- (iii) The Court cannot issue the Proclamation as a matter of course because the Police is asking for it. The Court must be *prima facie* satisfied that the person has absconded or is concealing himself so that the warrant of arrest, previously issued, *cannot* be executed, despite reasonable diligence. (See ***Bishundayal Mahton and others Vs. Emperor : AIR 1943 Patna 366 and Devender Singh Negi Vs. State of U.P. : 1994 CrL LJ (Allahabad HC) 1783***).
- (iv) The requisite date and place for appearance must be specified in the proclamation requiring such person to appear on such date at the specified place. Such date must not be less than 30 clear days from the date of issuance and *publication of the proclamation*. (See ***Gurappa Gugal and others Vs. State of Mysore : 1969 CriLJ 826 and Shokat Ali Vs. State of Haryana : 2020(2) RCR (Criminal)***).

339).

- (v) Where the period between issuance and publication of the proclamation and the specified date of hearing is less than thirty days, the accused cannot be declared a proclaimed person/offender and the proclamation has to be issued and published again. (See ***Dilbagh Singh Vs. State of Punjab (P&H) : 2015 (8) R.C.R. (criminal) 166*** and ***Ashok Kumar Vs. State of Haryana and another : 2013 (4) RCR (Criminal) 550***)
- (vi) The Proclamation has to be published in the manner laid down in Section 82 (2) of the Cr.P.C.. For publication the proclamation has to be first publicly read in some conspicuous place of the town or village in which the accused ordinarily resides; then the same has to be affixed to some conspicuous part of the house or homestead in which the accused ordinarily resides or to some conspicuous place of such town or village and thereafter a copy of the proclamation has to be affixed to some conspicuous part of the Court-house. The three sub-clauses (a)-(c) in Section 82 (2)(i) of the Cr.P.C. are conjunctive and not disjunctive, which means that there would be no valid publication of the proclamation unless all the three modes of publication are proved. (See ***Pawan Kumar Gupta Vs. The State of W.B. : 1973 CriLJ 1368***). Where the Court so orders a copy of the proclamation has to be additionally published in a daily newspaper circulating in the place in which the accused ordinarily resides. Advisably, proclamation has to be issued with four copies so that one each of the three copies of the proclamation may be affixed to some conspicuous part of the house or homestead in which the accused ordinarily resides, to some conspicuous place of such town or village and to some conspicuous part of the Court-house and report regarding publication may be made on the fourth copy of the proclamation. Additional copy will be required where the proclamation is also required to be published in the newspaper.
- (vii) Statement of the serving officer has to be recorded by the Court as to the date and mode of publication of the proclamation. (See ***Birad Dan Vs. State : 1958 CriLJ 965***).
- (viii) The Court issuing the proclamation has to make a statement in writing in its order that the proclamation was duly published on a specified day in a manner specified in Section 82(2)(i) of the Cr.P.C.. Such statement in writing by the Court is declared to be conclusive evidence that the

requirements of Section 82 have been complied with and that the proclamation was published on such day. (See ***Birad Dan Vs. State : 1958 CriLJ 965***).

- (xi) The conditions specified in Section 82(2) of the Cr.P.C. for the publication of a Proclamation against an absconder are mandatory. Any non-compliance therewith cannot be cured as an 'irregularity' and renders the Proclamation and proceedings subsequent thereto a nullity. (See ***Devendra Singh Negi alias Debu Vs. State of U.P. and another : 1994 CriLJ 1783*** and ***Pal Singh Vs. The State : 1955 CriLJ 318***).

In ***Dilbagh Singh Vs. State of Punjab (P&H) : 2015 (8) R.C.R. (criminal) 166*** it was held by this Court that in order to ensure that an accused should have a fair opportunity to appear, 30 days clear notice is necessary and the proclamation should be published in the manner provided by law. In that case, proclamation of the petitioner was issued on 20.08.2014 for 23.08.2014 and vide impugned order dated 25.09.2014 the petitioner was declared proclaimed offender. Clear notice of 30 days as mandated under Section 82 of the Cr.P.C. was not given to the petitioner and the procedure for publication of the proclamation was also not followed. The petitioner was held to have been wrongly declared a proclaimed offender and the impugned order was quashed.

In ***Ashok Kumar Vs. State of Haryana and another : 2013 (4) RCR (Criminal) 550*** the case was adjourned by the trial Court vide order dated 04.01.2013 for issuance of proclamation under Section 82 of the Cr.P.C. for 06.03.2014 but period of 30 days had not elapsed from the date of publication till 06.03.2014. On that date case was adjourned to 13.03.2014 on which date the petitioner was declared as proclaimed offender. It was held by this Court that the proclamation was not published in accordance with the procedure prescribed under Section 82(1) of the Cr.P.C. by giving mandatory period of 30 days from the date of publication of the proclamation till the date of hearing fixed in the case for appearance of the petitioner and that the mere fact that on 06.03.2014 the Court adjourned the case to 13.03.2014 for completing the period of 30 days could not be treated as compliance of the provisions of Section 82(1) of the Cr.P.C. Accordingly, the order

declaring the petitioner as proclaimed offender was set aside.

In *Harvinder Singh Vs. State of Haryana and another : 2021 (1) RCR (Criminal) 493* where proclamation was not publicly read out in some conspicuous place in village where the petitioner ordinarily resided, it was held that essential condition laid down in Section 82(2)(i)(a) of the Cr.P.C. as to mode of publication of the proclamation was not complied with and the order declaring the petitioner as proclaimed person and all consequential proceedings were quashed.

The facts of the present case are similar to those of the cases referred above. In the present case vide order dated 15.09.2020 proclamation was ordered to be published against the petitioner under Section 82 of the Cr.P.C. requiring the petitioner to appear before the Court on 07.10.2020. The proclamation was published on 02.10.2020. The petitioner was not given statutory minimum period of thirty days from 02.10.2020, the date of publication of the proclamation issued in terms of order dated 15.09.2020 till 07.10.2020, the date fixed for his appearance before the Court. Vide order dated 07.10.2020 learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, Moga adjourned the case to 04.11.2020 for awaiting the appearance of the petitioner on the ground that statutory period of thirty days had not elapsed. could not extend the time by simply adjourning the case for awaiting appearance of the petitioner and was mandatorily required to issue the proclamation again for publication thereof in accordance with the provisions of Section 82(2) of the Cr.P.C.. However, learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, Moga failed to do so. It follows that the petitioner was wrongly declared proclaimed person vide impugned order dated 05.11.2020 in breach of the prescribed procedure and revision filed against order dated 05.11.2020 has been wrongly dismissed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Moga. Therefore, impugned orders dated 05.11.2020 and 04.03.2021 suffer from material illegality and are liable to be quashed.

In view of the above discussion, the petition is allowed and impugned order dated 05.11.2020 passed by learned Judicial Magistrate

First Class, Moga in case FIR No.69 dated 12.07.2020 registered under Section 306 read with Section 34 of the IPC in Police Station Kot Ise Khan, District Moga whereby the petitioner was declared proclaimed person and order dated 04.03.2021 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Moga whereby revision against the same was dismissed are quashed along with all consequential proceedings arising out of the same.

However, the petitioner is directed to surrender before the trial Court in case FIR No.69 dated 12.07.2020 registered under Section 306 read with Section 34 of the IPC in Police Station Kot Ise Khan, District Moga within **four weeks** and on such surrender, subject to order, if any, for grant of anticipatory bail, the petitioner shall be liable to be remanded to police/judicial custody in view of stage of the case in accordance with law as the case may be. Needless to observed that on surrender the petitioner shall be entitled to apply to the trial Court for grant of regular bail and the trial Court shall be bound to dispose of the same expeditiously in accordance with law.

However, nothing in this order shall be treated as expression of any opinion on merits so as to bind or influence the trial Court in disposal of the petition for grant of regular bail or the case on merits.

28.04.2021
kothiyal

(ARUN KUMAR TYAGI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No