

2024:PHHC:081126



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

140

CRM-M-30884-2024 (O&M)
Date of decision: 01.07.2024

Dharminder Singh @ Gurminder Singh ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Mr. Balbir Singh Jaswal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Ruchika Sabherwal, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of order dated 02.04.2022, passed by the Judicial Magistrate First Class, Baba Bakala Sahib in case titled as *State vs. Gurminder Singh and another*, arising out of FIR No. 86 dated 29.11.2016, registered under Sections 323, 452, 427, 509, 506, 148 and 149 of IPC at Police Station Tarsikka, District Amritsar, whereby the petitioner had been declared a proclaimed offender.

2. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner on the grounds and it has been argued by his counsel that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. A cross case had also been registered against the complainant party. It is further argued that vide judgments dated 14.09.2022 (Annexures P-2 & P-3), both the parties, after facing full length

2024:PHHC:081126



trial, had been acquitted by the trial Court from the charges framed against them in the said FIR as well as in its cross version. However, since the petitioner had been travelling abroad and coming back to India on different occasions and also that his name was mentioned as Gurminder Singh, whereas his correct name is Dharminster Singh, he was never served with the summons/warrants issued by the trial Court and had been declared a proclaimed offender 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.

3. Learned State counsel, who has advance notice of the petition, has argued that the petitioner was having knowledge about the pendency of the trial and had intentionally avoided his appearance before the trial Court. Therefore, he was rightly declared a proclaimed offender. Hence, it is urged that the petition is liable to be dismissed.

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

5. 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 him a proclaimed offender, I am of the considered opinion that the impugned order dated 02.04.2022 suffers from material illegalities and is liable to be quashed with all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom.

6. There are catena of judgments of different High Courts discussing the requirements necessary for issuance and publication of

2024:PHHC:081126



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 CrL 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*, *Negialias Debu Vs. State of U.P. and another, 1994 Cri LJ 1783* and *Pal Singh Vs. The State : 1955 CriLJ 318*.

7. After going through the material placed on record as well as the copies of zimini orders passed by the trial Court, it is revealed that on 11.10.2021, the trial Court had ordered for issuance of proclamation against the petitioner for 09.11.2021. A bare perusal of this order shows that the trial Court before ordering for publication of proclamation has not recorded its satisfaction much less proper satisfaction that that the petitioner had absconded or was concealing himself so that the warrant of arrest, previously issued, cannot be executed, despite reasonable diligence, which was in violation of the provisions of Section 82(1) of Cr.P.C. Reliance in this regard can be placed upon *Rohit Kumar Vs. State of Delhi : 2008 CrL J. 2561*.

8. Further, a perusal of order dated 11.10.2021 also reveals that the proclamation against the petitioner and co-accused was issued for 09.11.2021,

2024:PHHC:081126



which means that the petitioner was not granted statutory period of 30 days to cause his 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. Reliance in this regard can be placed upon *Gurappa Gugal and others Vs. State of Mysore : 1969 CriLJ 826* and *Shokat Ali Vs. State of Haryana : 2020(2) RCR (Criminal) 339*.

9. Accordingly, in view of the discussion as made above and also in view of the ratio of law as laid down in above cited authorities, the present petition is allowed and the impugned order dated 02.04.2022, passed by the Judicial Magistrate First Class, Baba Bakala Sahib in case titled as *State vs. Gurminder Singh and another*, arising out of FIR No. 86 dated 29.11.2016, registered under Sections 323, 452, 427, 509, 506, 148 and 149 of IPC at Police Station Tarsikka, District Amritsar, whereby the petitioner had been declared a proclaimed offender, is quashed with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom.

10. However, the petitioner is directed to surrender before the Court concerned within a period of four weeks, subject to order for grant of anticipatory bail, if any passed on his 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.

2024:PHHC:081126



11. 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.
12. Till the appearance of the petitioner before the trial Court, his arrest shall remain stayed.
13. It is made clear that in case the petitioner fails to appear before the trial Court within a period of four weeks from today, this petition shall be deemed to be dismissed.

01.07.2024

Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No