

2024:PHHC:116638



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

124

CRM-M-43153-2024 (O&M)
Date of decision: 05.09.2024

Nisha Kukreja ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Mr. Gursimran Singh Madaan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

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 15.07.2024, passed by the Judicial Magistrate First Class, Faridabad in case titled as **Ramesh Singh Rawat vs. Nisha Kukreja and others**, arising out complaint bearing No. NACT/59126/2022, filed under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments (*for short 'N. I. Act'*), whereby the petitioner had been declared a proclaimed person.
2. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner on the grounds and it has been argued by his counsel that the aforesaid complaint has been filed on false and frivolous grounds. It is further argued that the petitioner had been declared a proclaimed person without following the proper procedure prescribed under Section 82 Cr.P.C. Hence, it is urged that the impugned order is liable to be set aside.
3. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and have also gone through the material placed on record.

2024:PHHC:116638



4. 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 person, I am of the considered opinion that the impugned order dated 15.07.2024 suffers from some illegalities and is liable to be quashed with all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom.

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

6. A perusal of the statement of the serving police official ESI Ramesh Kumar, recorded on 13.06.2024, reveals that the proclamation was not read over in some conspicuous place of the town or village in which the petitioner was supposed to be residing. As per Section 82 (2) of the Cr.P.C..

2024:PHHC:116638



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. Reliance in this regard can be placed upon *Pawan Kumar Gupta Vs. The State of W.B. : 1973 CriLJ 1368*.

7. 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 15.07.2024, passed by the Judicial Magistrate First Class, Faridabad in case titled as *Ramesh Singh Rawat vs. Nisha Kukreja and others*, arising out complaint bearing No. NACT/59126/2022, filed under Section 138 of the N. I. Act, whereby the petitioner had been declared a proclaimed person, is quashed with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom.

8. However, the petitioner is directed to surrender before the Court concerned within a period of three weeks, subject to order for grant of anticipatory bail, if any, passed on his petition to be filed under Section 482 of BNSS. 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

2024:PHHC:116638



subject to any order for grant of regular bail to be passed by the concerned Court in accordance with law.

9. 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.

10. Till the appearance of the petitioner before the trial Court, his arrest shall remain stayed.

11. 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.

05.09.2024

Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No