



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

121

CRM-M-56256-2024 (O&M)
Date of decision: 12.11.2024

Atul Jaiswal

...Petitioner

Versus

M/s Nector Biopharma Pvt. Ltd.

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Mr. G. S. Sawhney, Advocate
for the petitioner.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023 for quashing of order dated 14.02.2023, passed by the Judicial Magistrate First Class, Chandigarh in case titled as ***Nector Biopharma vs. M/s Deep Medical***, arising out complaint bearing No. NACT/18241 of 2019, filed under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act (*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 petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioner had no knowledge about the pendency of the aforesaid complaint as he was never served upon with any notice/warrants issued by the trial Court. More so, 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 at considerable length and have also gone through the material placed on record.

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 14.02.2023 suffers from material 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. After going through the material placed on record as well as the copies of zimini orders passed by the learned trial Court, it is revealed that on 29.11.2022, since the non-bailable warrants issued against the petitioner were



received back unserved, the learned trial Court had ordered for issuance of proclamation against him for 19.01.2023. A perusal of the statement of the serving police official shows that the proclamation was executed on 10.01.2023 requiring the petitioner to cause his appearance before the learned trial Court, which means that the petitioner was granted only 09 days' time 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 judgment cited as ***Gurappa Gugal and others Vs. State of Mysore : 1969 CriLJ 826*** and ***Shokat Ali Vs. State of Haryana : 2020(2) RCR (Criminal) 339***.

7. Further, on 19.01.2023, the proclamation was received back executed but the case was adjourned to 14.02.2023 awaiting the presence of the petitioner, by making observation that the mandatory period of 30 days had not elapsed. However, while adjourning the case to 14.02.2023, the learned trial Court failed to consider the fact that it could not have extended the time by simply adjourning the case as a fresh proclamation was required to be published 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***.

8. 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 14.02.2023, passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, Chandigarh in case titled as ***Nector***



Biopharma vs. M/s Deep Medical, arising out complaint bearing No. NACT/18241 of 2019, 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.

9. 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 482 of BNSS, 2023. 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.

10. 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.

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

12. 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.

12.11.2024

Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No