



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

118

CRM-M-63191-2023 (O&M)
Date of decision: 21.05.2024

Amrik Singh ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Mr. Arnav Sood, 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. seeking quashing of order dated 06.02.2020 (Annexure P-6), passed by the Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Garhshankar, in case titled as *State vs. Amrik Singh*, arising out of FIR No. 233 dated 08.12.2018, registered under Sections 498-A and 406 of IPC at Police Station Garhshankar, District Hoshiarpur, whereby he 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 while declaring him a proclaimed offender, the proper procedure as laid down under Section 82 Cr.P.C. had not been followed. The petitioner even before registration of the aforesaid FIR had left India for Kuwait on 19.02.2018 and has never returned

back to India since then, whereas the FIR was registered on 08.12.2018. The petitioner was never served at his ordinary place of residence in Kuwait and he 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 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 20.02.2020 suffers from material illegalities and is liable to be quashed with all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom.

6. At the outset, it would be relevant to refer to the provision of Section 82 Cr.P.C., which provides for publication of proclamation against the person absconding. It reads as under:

“82. Proclamation for person absconding. –

(1) If any Court has reason to believe (whether after taking evidence or not) that any person against whom a warrant has

Neutral Citation No. 2024:PHHC:072114

been issued by it has absconded or is concealing himself so that such warrant cannot be executed, such Court may publish a written proclamation requiring him to appear at a specified place and at a specified time not less than thirty days from the date of publishing such proclamation.

(2) The proclamation shall be published as follows:-

(i) (a) it shall be publicly read in some conspicuous place of the town or village in which such person ordinarily resides;

(b) it shall be affixed to some conspicuous part of the house or homestead in which such person ordinarily resides or to some conspicuous place of such town or village;

(c) a copy thereof shall be affixed to some conspicuous part of the Court-house;

(ii) the Court may also, if it thinks fit, direct a copy of the proclamation to be published in a daily newspaper circulating in the place in which such person ordinarily resides.

(3) A statement in writing by the Court issuing the proclamation to the effect that the proclamation was duly published on a specified day, in the manner specified in clause (i) of sub-section (2), shall be conclusive evidence that the requirements of this section have been complied with, and that the proclamation was published on such day.

(4) Where a proclamation published under sub-section (1) is in respect of a person accused of an offence punishable under section 302, 304, 364, 367, 382, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 402, 436, 449, 459 or 460 of the Indian Penal Code (45 of 1860), and such person fails to appear at the specified place and time required by the proclamation, the Court may, after making such inquiry as it thinks fit, pronounce him a proclaimed offender and make a declaration to that effect.

(5) The provisions of sub-sections (2) and (3) shall apply to a declaration made by the Court under sub-section (4) as they apply to the proclamation published under subsection (1).”

7. 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, 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.***

8. The position of law as laid down in the above cited authorities may be summarized as under:

- (i) Prior issuance of warrant of arrest by the Court is sine qua non for issuance and publication of the proclamation and the Court has to first issue warrant of arrest against the person concerned.
- (ii) There must be a report before the Court that the person against whom warrant was issued had absconded or had been concealing himself so that the warrant of arrest could not be executed against him. However, the Court is not bound to take evidence in this regard before issuing a Proclamation under Section 82 (1) of the Cr.P.C.
- (iii) The Court cannot issue the Proclamation as a matter of course because the Police is asking for it. The Court must be

Neutral Citation No. 2024:PHHC:072114

prima facie satisfied that the person has absconded or is concealing himself so that the warrant of arrest, previously issued, cannot be executed, despite reasonable diligence.

(iv) The requisite date and place for appearance must be specified in the proclamation requiring such person to appear on such date at the specified place. Such date must not be less than 30 clear days from the date of issuance and publication of the proclamation.

(v) Where the period between issuance and publication of the proclamation and the specified date of hearing is less than thirty days, the accused cannot be declared a proclaimed person/offender and the proclamation has to be issued and published again.

(vi) The Proclamation has to be published in the manner laid down in Section 82 (2) of the Cr.P.C.. 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. Where the Court so orders a copy of the proclamation has to be additionally published in a daily newspaper circulating in the place in which the accused ordinarily resides. Advisably, proclamation has to be issued with four copies so that one each of the three copies of the proclamation may be affixed to some conspicuous part of the house or homestead in which the accused ordinarily resides, to some conspicuous place of such town or village and to some conspicuous part of the Courthouse and report regarding publication may be made on the fourth copy of the

Neutral Citation No. 2024:PHHC:072114

proclamation. Additional copy will be required where the proclamation is also required to be published in the newspaper.

(vii) Statement of the serving officer has to be recorded by the Court as to the date and mode of publication of the proclamation.

(viii) The Court issuing the proclamation has to make a statement in writing in its order that the proclamation was duly published on a specified day in a manner specified in Section 82(2)(i) of the Cr.P.C.. Such statement in writing by the Court is declared to be conclusive evidence that the requirements of Section 82 have been complied with and that the proclamation was published on such day.

(xi) The conditions specified in Section 82(2) of the 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.

9. On applying the above discussed position of law to the peculiar facts and circumstances of the present case and on a perusal of the copies of the zimini orders, which have been placed on record, it is apparent that on 03.09.2019, the trial Court, by observing that non-bailable warrants issued against the petitioner were received back unserved, recorded its satisfaction that the presence of the petitioner could not be procured through ordinary process and issued proclamation under Section 82 Cr.P.C. for 30.10.2019. On 30.10.2019, fresh proclamation was issued for 19.12.2019 as the earlier proclamation could not be issued. Thereafter, when the case was taken up on 19.12.2019, the proclamation was received back executed but since the petitioner had not appeared, the case was adjourned to 06.02.2020 with a notice to the serving constable for the said date, on which date, the petitioner was declared a proclaimed offender by passing the impugned order.

Neutral Citation No. 2024:PHHC:072114

However, while adjourning the case, the trial Court had failed to consider the fact that it could not simply adjourn the case and a fresh proclamation was required to be issued. Reference in this context can be made to ***Dilbagh Singh Vs. State of Punjab (P&H) : 2015 (8) R.C.R. (criminal) 166.***

10. Further, it has also come on record that the petitioner had left India for Kuwait on 19.02.2018, whereas the FIR in question was registered on 08.12.2018. The petitioner has placed on record photocopy of his passport, which bears the stamp impression of the Kuwait immigration authorities, showing that the petitioner had reached Kuwait on 19.02.2018. It is the claim of the petitioner that he has never come back to India since then. However, the orders passed by the trial Court simply reveal that the warrants issued against the petitioner had been received back unexecuted without satisfying itself as to whether he was reported to have gone abroad or his whereabouts were otherwise not known. In the FIR itself, there was no mention that the petitioner was in India and no efforts whatsoever were made by the Court to ask the complainant the address of the petitioner of the country, where process could be sent to him. No letter to Ministry of External Affairs qua service of notice/warrants/proclamation against the petitioner is shown to have been written by the trial Court. As such, it can reasonably be presumed that the process never reached the petitioner and hence, he had no occasion to conceal himself. As such, the action of the trial Court by switching to the proclamation proceedings under Section 82 Cr.P.C. can itself be stated to be bad in the eyes of law. Reliance in this context can be placed upon ***Manjit Kaur vs. State of Punjab : 2013 SCC Online (P&H) 8663.***

Neutral Citation No. 2024:PHHC:072114

11. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the impugned order dated 06.02.2020 (Annexure P-6), passed by the Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Garhshankar, in case titled as *State vs. Amrik Singh*, arising out of FIR No. 233 dated 08.12.2018, registered under Sections 498-A and 406 of IPC at Police Station Garhshankar, District Hoshiarpur, whereby he had been declared a proclaimed offender, is quashed with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom.

12. However, the petitioner is directed to surrender before the Court concerned within a period of sxi 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.

13. 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.

21.05.2024

Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes

Whether reportable

Yes