

CRM-M-549-2024
Date of decision: 08.01.2024

Jaswant Singh @ KaluPetitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Ruhani Chadha, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Subhash Godara, Addl.A.G., Punjab.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

The prayer in the present petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is for quashing of impugned order dated 14.10.2022 (Annexure P-6) vide which the petitioner has been declared as proclaimed person in case bearing FIR No.162 dated 28.07.2019 under Sections 452/323/506/148 of IPC registered at Police Station Sultanpur Lodhi, District Kapurthala (Annexure P-1).

2. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that the petitioner was granted the concession of interim bail vide order dated 16.10.2019 by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Kapurthala and further vide order dated 30.10.2019, the interim bail was made absolute. He further submits that no notice regarding putting in appearance was ever served upon the petitioner after being released on anticipatory bail. On 03.09.2022, the bail order of the petitioner was cancelled, bail bonds/surety bonds were also cancelled and forfeited to the State and non-bailable warrants were issued against him for 01.10.2022. On 01.10.2022, on receipt of report regarding non-

CRM-M-549-2024**-2-**

bailable warrants issued against the petitioner/accused received back unexecuted, the trial Court issued proclamation under Section 82 of Cr.P.C. against the petitioner for 14.10.2022. On 14.10.2022, the trial Court declared the petitioner as proclaimed person. Aggrieved by the said impugned order dated 14.10.2022 (Annexure P-6), the petitioner has approached this Court by way of instant petition.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the non-bailable warrants issued to the petitioner were never served and, therefore, the finding of the trial Court that the petitioner is intentionally evading his arrest, is erroneous. Further, the trial Court vide order dated 01.10.2022 observed that since non-bailable warrants have not been executed till date, he cannot be served through ordinary process and issued proclamation under Section 82 Cr.P.C. for 14.10.2022. Ultimately, vide impugned order dated 14.10.2022 (Annexure P-6), the petitioner has been declared as proclaimed person. It is contended that the impugned order is liable to be set aside on the ground that the mandate of Section 82 of Cr.P.C. has not been followed in its letter and spirit by the trial Court.

4. It is also submitted that the petitioner undertakes to appear before the trial Court on each and every date.

5. Notice of motion to the official respondents.

6. Mr. Subhash Godara, Addl.A.G., Punjab, who is present in Court, accepts notice for the respondent and supports the order passed by the learned trial Court by contending that the petitioner does not put in appearance before the trial Court intentionally and deliberately and, therefore, having left with no other option, proclamation was issued to secure his presence.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record of the case with their able assistance and with the consent of parties, the matter is taken up for final disposal.

8. 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.

9. A perusal of the impugned order reveals that the trial Court issued proclamation without recording reasons of its belief that the petitioner has absconded or is concealing himself. 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 before issuance of process under Section 82 of Cr.P.C. and non-recording of the satisfaction itself makes such order suffering from incurable illegality. In the judgment passed by this Court in ***Sonu Vs. State of Haryana 2021 (1) RCR (CrI.) 319***, it has been held that the conditions specified in Section 82 (2) 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.

10. The sole purpose of issuance of warrants of arrest or issuance of proclamation is to secure presence of the accused before the trial Court. The

CRM-M-549-2024

-4-

petitioner, in the present case has himself come forward and has undertaken to appear before the trial Court on each and every date.

11. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, the present petition is allowed without issuing notice to respondent No.2 in order to save time of the Court and to avoid litigation expenses to be incurred on the part of respondent No.2, the impugned order dated 14.10.2022 (Annexure P-6) vide which petitioner was declared as proclaimed person, is hereby set aside.

12. The petitioner is directed to appear before the trial Court within a period of 15 days from today and on his doing so, he shall be admitted to bail on his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court, along with costs of Rs.10,000/- to be deposited with the District Legal Services Authority, Kapurthala, for wasting precious time of the Court.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

08.01.2024
Neha

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