



127

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

CRM-M-33378-2024

Date of decision: 16.07.2024

Parveen Kumar

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR**Present:** Mr. Anterpreet Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

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

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. seeking quashing of order dated 10.05.2016 (Annexure P-4) passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Ludhiana, vide which the petitioner has been declared as proclaimed person in case bearing FIR No.54 dated 29.05.2015 under Sections 406/498-A of IPC registered at Police Station Women, District Ludhiana.

2. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the FIR (*supra*) being brother-in-law of the complainant. He further submits that at the time of registration of the FIR, the petitioner was not present in Ludhiana and has gone to Gorakhpur on 29.04.2015 for his treatment i.e. much prior to the registration of the FIR and he was not aware about the proceedings initiated against him and, therefore, the learned Court below has wrongly declared him as proclaimed person. It is further contended that after returning from Gorakhpur, petitioner remained at his home at Ludhiana due to his health issues and never

**CRM-M-33378-2024****-2-**

absconded from any process of law. Aggrieved by the said impugned order dated 10.05.2016 (Annexure P-4), the petitioner has approached this Court by way of instant petition.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that he has not received any summons from the learned Court neither any police officer came to serve the summon and, therefore, the finding of the trial Court that the petitioner is intentionally evading his arrest, is erroneous. Ultimately, vide impugned order dated 10.05.2016, 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.

6. Mr. Subhash Godara, Addl.A.G., Punjab, who is present in Court, accepts notice for the respondent-State 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 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



CRM-M-33378-2024

-3-

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 (CrL) 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 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.

11. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, the present petition is allowed and the impugned order dated 10.05.2016 (Annexure P-4) vide which the 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 Poor Patient Welfare Fund, PGIMER, Chandigarh, for wasting precious time of the Court.

The receipt of payment of costs imposed must be presented before the learned trial Court. The learned Court below is directed to grant bail to the petitioner only upon verification of the payment of said costs.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

16.07.2024
Neha

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