

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

CRM-M-51632-2023
Date of decision: 21.12.2023

Rajinder Kumar @ Rajinder Hans @ RKPetitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Manmeet Singh Rana, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. I.P.S. Sabharwal, DAG, Punjab.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

The prayer in the present petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is for quashing of order dated 11.06.2018 (Annexure P-3) passed in CHI/1001/2014 titled as '*State of Punjab Vs. Rajinder Kumar*' whereby, the petitioner has been declared as proclaimed offender in a case bearing FIR No.132 dated 29.05.2014 (Annexure P-1) under Sections 406/420 of IPC registered at Police Station Rama Mandi, District Jalandhar City on the basis of compromise (Annexure P-2).

2. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that during the pendency of the trial, oral compromise has been effected between the complainant and the petitioner, however, the same could not be reduced into writing as the complainant had unfortunately died on 04.06.2019. Thereafter, now the compromise has been reduced into writing with the wife of the complainant-Saravjit Kaur vide compromise deed dated 30.06.2023 (Annexure P-2). He further submits that six trials were pending against the

petitioner and in one of the cases, he could not appear before the learned trial Court and non-bailable warrants have been issued against him. Since, all the cases pertain to the same police station and pending before the same Court, therefore, he could not appear in rest of the cases and ultimately declared proclaimed offender vide order dated 11.06.2018 (Annexure P-3). Aggrieved by the said impugned order dated 11.06.2018 (Annexure P-3), the petitioner has approached this Court by way of instant petition.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the impugned order is liable to be set aside on the ground that the mandate of Section 82 Cr.P.C. has not been followed in its letter and spirit by the trial Court as the petitioner was convicted in two other cases bearing FIR No.221 dated 23.11.2010 and FIR No.265 dated 29.11.2012 under the Gambling Act when proclamation was issued against him. In support of his arguments, counsel for the petitioner relies upon the judgment passed by this Court in ***Sonu vs. State of Haryana 2021 (1) RCR (Cri.) 319*** and the judgment passed by the Gujarat High Court in ***Govindbhai Patel Vs. State of Gujarat 2004 (4) RCR (Criminal) 830***. It is further submitted that the petitioner undertakes to appear before the trial Court on each and every date and also the petitioner has entered into a compromise with the wife of the complainant, in proof of which, a compromise dated 30.06.2023 (Annexure P-2) is annexed with the present petition.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. I.P.S. Sabharwal, DAG, Punjab who is present in Court accepts notice for the official respondents and supports the order passed by the learned trial Court by contending that the petitioner did not put in appearance before the trial Court intentionally and deliberately and, therefore, having left with no

other option, proclamation was issued against him to secure his presence.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record of the case with their able assistance.

7. While the scheme of criminal justice system necessitates curtailment of personal liberty to some extent, it is of the utmost importance that the same is done in line with the procedure established by law to maintain a healthy balance between personal liberty of the individual-accused and interests of the society in promoting law and order. Such procedure must be compatible with Article 21 of the Constitution of India i.e. it must be fair, just and not suffer from the vice of arbitrariness or unreasonableness.

8. This Court in the judgment passed in ***Major Singh @ Major Vs. State of Punjab 2023 (3) RCR (Criminal) 406; 2023 (2) Law Herald 1506*** has held that the Court is first required to record its satisfaction that the accused is intentionally concealing himself and his presence cannot be secured by any other means before issuance of process under Section 82 and non-recording of the satisfaction itself makes such order suffering from incurable illegality.

9. The sole purpose of issuance of non-bailable warrants or issuance of proclamation is to secure presence of the accused before the trial Court. The petitioner in the present case has himself come forward and has undertaken to appear before the trial Court on each and every date.

10. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, the present petition is allowed and the impugned order dated 11.06.2018 (Annexure P-3) vide which the petitioner was declared proclaimed offender is hereby set aside.

The petitioner is directed to appear before the trial Court within a period of four weeks from today and on his doing so, he shall be admitted to bail on his

CRM-M-51632-2023

-4-

furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court,
along with costs of Rs.3,000/- to be deposited with the District Legal Services
Authority Jalandhar, for wasting precious time of the Court.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

21.12.2023
Neha

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