

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND
HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

260

CRM-M-27338-2015 (O&M)
Date of decision: 01.03.2024

Jagdish Kaur

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Mr. Amit Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Ruchika Sabherwal, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Upender Prashar, Advocate
for respondent No. 2.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 482 Cr.P.C. seeking quashing of order dated 30.07.2014 (Annexure P-3), passed by the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Amritsar, in case titled as *State vs. Arun Kumar etc.*, arising out of FIR No. 03 dated 15.02.2014, registered under Sections 498-A and 406 of the IPC at Police Station NRI, Amritsar, District Amritsar, whereby she had been declared a proclaimed person.
2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the statement of complainant/respondent No. 2 Rimpay Soi alleging therein that she and Arun Kumar, who is son of the present petitioner, had come in contact with each

Neutral Citation No. 2024:PHHC:031440

other through a matrimonial website. Arun Kumar was residing in Australia. Their marriage was solemnized on 15.12.2013 but the family members of Arun Kumar did not attend the same and on asking the reason for the same, Arun Kumar told the complainant that they were busy in Australia and could not get leave. Sufficient dowry articles were given in the marriage. The husband of the complainant had gone to Australia alone but subsequently, the complainant also reached Australia 29.07.2013. She alleged that she was subjected to cruelty and harassment on account of demand of dowry and her dowry articles were misappropriated by the accused persons. After registration of the FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated and after completion of the same, the *challan* was presented in Court. However, since the presence of the petitioner could not be secured, proceedings under Section 82 Cr.P.C. were initiated against her and she was declared a proclaimed person, vide impugned order dated 30.07.2014.

3. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner on the grounds and it has been argued by her counsel that while declaring her a proclaimed person, the proper procedure as laid down under Section 82 Cr.P.C. had not been followed. The petitioner was not in India either at the time of marriage of the parties or at the time of registration of the FIR, which is also evident from the contents of the FIR itself. The petitioner was never served at her ordinary place of residence in Australia and she had been declared a proclaimed person without following the proper procedure prescribed under Section 82 Cr.P.C. With these broad submissions, learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the impugned order is liable to be set aside.

Neutral Citation No. 2024:PHHC:031440

4. Learned State counsel, assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, has argued that the petitioner was having knowledge about the pendency of the trial and had intentionally avoided her appearance before the trial Court. Therefore, she was rightly declared a proclaimed person. Hence, it is urged that the petition is liable to be dismissed.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have also gone through the material placed on record.

6. On giving due deliberations to the contentions as raised by learned counsel for the parties and on an overall perusal of the orders passed by the trial Court from the date of initiating proceedings under Section 82 Cr.P.C. as against the petitioner till the date of declaring her a proclaimed person, I am of the considered opinion that the impugned order dated 30.07.2014 suffers from material illegalities and is liable to be quashed with all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom.

7. At the outset, it would be relevant to refer to the provision of Section 82 Cr.P.C., which provides for publication of proclamation against the person absconding. It 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;

Neutral Citation No. 2024:PHHC:031440

(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 subsection (1)."

8. There are catena of judgments of different High Courts discussing the requirements necessary for issuance and publication of proclamation against an absconder under Section 82 Cr.P.C. and for declaring him as a proclaimed person/offender. These requirements have been discussed from time to time in ***Rohit Kumar Vs. State of Delhi : 2008 CrL J. 2561, Rohit Kumar Vs. State of Delhi : 2008 CrL J. 2561, Bishundayal Mahton and others Vs. Emperor : AIR 1943 Patna 366, Devender Singh Negi Vs.***

State of U.P. : 1994 Cri LJ (Allahabad HC) 1783, Gurappa Gugal and others Vs. State of Mysore : 1969 CriLJ 826, Shokat Ali Vs. State of Haryana : 2020(2) RCR (Criminal) 339, Dilbagh Singh Vs. State of Punjab : (P&H) 2015 (8) R.C.R. (criminal) 166, Ashok Kumar Vs. State of Haryana and another : 2013 (4) RCR (Criminal) 550, Pawan Kumar Gupta Vs. The State of W.B. : 1973 CriLJ 1368, Birad Dan Vs. State : 1958 CriLJ 965, Birad Dan Vs. State : 1958 CriLJ 965, Negi alias Debu Vs. State of U.P. and another, 1994 Cri LJ 1783 and Pal Singh Vs. The State : 1955 CriLJ 318.

9. The position of law as laid down in the above cited authorities 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.
- (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.
- (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.
- (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.
- (v) Where the period between issuance and publication of the proclamation and the specified date of hearing is less than thirty

Neutral Citation No. 2024:PHHC:031440

days, the accused cannot be declared a proclaimed person/offender and the proclamation has to be issued and published again.

(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. 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 Courthouse 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.

(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

Neutral Citation No. 2024:PHHC:031440

Section 82 have been complied with and that the proclamation was published on such day.

(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.

10. On applying the above discussed position of law to the peculiar facts and circumstances of the present case and on a perusal of the order dated 12.05.2014, it is apparent that proclamation was ordered to be published for 04.06.2014, which means that the petitioner was granted only 21 days' time to cause her appearance before the trial Court. Hence, the same was in clear violation of the provisions of Section 82(1) Cr.P.C., as per which, a specified time of not less than 30 days is required to be given to the accused from the date of publishing such proclamation which is mandatory in nature. More so, the report of the serving police official HC Resham Singh shows that he has published the proclamation only on 02.06.2014, requiring the petitioner to cause appearance before the trial Court on 04.06.2014, i.e. just after two days of publishing the proclamation. On 04.06.2014, the trial Court had adjourned the case to 30.07.2014 by observing that stipulated period of 30 days for the appearance of the petitioner was yet to elapse. However, the trial Court had failed to consider that it could not have simply adjourned the case and a fresh publication was required to be issued, once the period between issuance of publication of proclamation and the specified period of hearing was less than 30 days. Reference in this context can be made to ***Dilbagh Singh Vs. State of Punjab (P&H) : 2015 (8) R.C.R. (criminal) 166***. A perusal of the report of serving police official further shows that the proclamation was not read over

Neutral Citation No. 2024:PHHC:031440

publicly in some conspicuous place of the town or village in which the accused was supposed to be residing, which is clear violation of the procedure laid down under Section 82(2)(i)(a). The three sub-clauses, which are (a) to (c) of Section 82 (2)(i) of 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. Reliance in this regard can be placed upon ***Pawan Kumar Gupta Vs. The State of W.B. : 1973 CriLJ 1368.***

11. Further, as per the allegations levelled in the FIR itself, the petitioner was residing in Australia at the time of registration of the FIR and she never came back to India subsequently. The orders passed by the trial Court simply reveal that the warrants issued against the petitioner had been received back unexecuted without satisfying itself as to whether she was reported to have gone abroad or her whereabouts were otherwise not known. Moreover, the petitioner has placed on record certified copy of her passport to show that she was in Australia at the relevant time. It is revealed from the record that no efforts whatsoever were made by the Court to ask the complainant about the address of the petitioner in Australia, where process could be sent to her. No letter to Ministry of External Affairs qua service of notice/warrants/proclamation against the petitioner is shown to have been written by the trial Court. As such, it can reasonably be presumed that the process never reached the petitioner and hence, she had no occasion to conceal herself. As such, the action of the trial Court by switching to the proclamation proceedings under Section 82 Cr.P.C. can itself be stated to be bad in the eyes of law. Reliance in this context can be placed upon ***Manjit Kaur vs. State of Punjab : 2013 SCC Online (P&H) 8663.***

Neutral Citation No. 2024:PHHC:031440

12. Accordingly, in view of the above discussion, the present petition is allowed and the impugned order dated 30.07.2014 (Annexure P-3), passed by the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Moga, Amritsar, in case titled as *State vs. Arun Kumar etc.*, arising out of FIR No. 03 dated 15.02.2014, registered under Sections 498-A and 406 of the IPC at Police Station NRI, Amritsar, District Amritsar, whereby the petitioner had been declared a proclaimed person, is quashed with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom.

13. However, the petitioner is directed to surrender before the Court concerned within a period of two months from today, subject to order for grant of anticipatory bail, if any passed on her petition to be filed under Section 438 of the Cr.P.C. In the absence of any order for grant of anticipatory bail and on such surrender, the petitioner shall be liable to be remanded to judicial custody subject to any order for grant of regular bail to be passed by the concerned Court in accordance with law.

14. Needless to observe that in case any application is filed before the concerned Court for grant of regular bail, then the concerned Court shall be bound to dispose of the same expeditiously and that nothing in this order shall be treated as expression of any opinion on merits so as to bind or influence the concerned Court in disposal of the same.

01.03.2024

Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes

Whether reportable

Yes