

Rajan Katna ....Petitioner

Wazir Chand Rakesh Kumar and another ...Respondents

**HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)**

2. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that the petitioner was on bail and vide order dated 21.11.2023, on account of his non appearance as he was suffering from dengue fever, the bail of the petitioner was cancelled and bail bonds/surety bonds were cancelled and forfeited to the State by the learned trial Court followed by issuance of non-bailable warrants of arrest against him for 05.12.2023. On 05.12.2023, a fine of Rs.2 lakhs was imposed upon the surety under Section 446 of Cr.P.C. On 06.12.2023, the petitioner moved an application before the learned Court below seeking recall of warrants of arrest dated 07.11.2023, 21.11.2023 and

05.12.2023 issued against him and the same was dismissed vide order dated 12.12.2023. On 19.12.2023, the learned trial Court issued proclamation under Section 82 of Cr.P.C. against the petitioner for 31.01.2024. It is further submitted that the said proclamation against the petitioner was published on 09.01.2024. On 19.02.2024, the trial Court declared the petitioner as proclaimed person. Aggrieved by the said impugned order dated 19.02.2024 (Annexure P-1), 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 19.12.2023 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 31.01.2024. Ultimately, vide impugned order dated 19.02.2024, 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. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and perused the record of the case.

6. 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.

7. 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.

8. 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.

9. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, the present petition is allowed, without issuing notice to the respondents in order to save

CRM-M-12830-2024

-4-

time of the Court and to avoid litigation expenses to be incurred on the part of the respondents, the impugned order dated 19.02.2024 (Annexure P-1) vide which the petitioner was declared as proclaimed person, is hereby set aside.

10. 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.5,000/- to be deposited with the District Legal Services Authority, Hoshiarpur, for wasting precious time of the Court.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)  
JUDGE

13.03.2024  
Neha

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