

furnishing bail/surety bonds.

3. It is vociferously argued by the learned counsel for the petitioner that main dispute which arose between the petitioner and the complainant in aforementioned complaint case has already been amicably settled before the National Lok Adalat vide its order dated 09.09.2023.

4. 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 come forward and appeared before the learned trial Court and has also been granted the concession of interim bail. Furthermore, the parties have arrived at a compromise and settled their dispute.

5. Moreover, the order declaring the petitioner as a Proclaimed Offender was passed on account of him being absent from the proceedings in the aforementioned complaint case, which was subsequently withdrawn by the complainant. Since the default stood condoned, as such the impugned order (AnnexureP-1) would not sustain either. Placing reliance upon the judgments passed by this Court in *Sher Singh Rana vs. State of Haryana* bearing CRM-M-No.20832 of 2021 and *Chetan Malhotra vs. State of Haryana* bearing CRM-M No.16641 of 2022, this petition is allowed and the impugned order dated 21.07.2023 (Annexure P-1) vide which the petitioner was declared proclaimed offender is set aside.

January 05, 2024
manisha

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

- | | | |
|------|---------------------------|--------|
| (i) | Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| (ii) | Whether reportable | Yes/No |