



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

11+289

CRM-M-1384-2024 (O&M)
Date of decision: 07.05.2024

Sandip Kumar ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Mr. Vishal Mittal, Advocate
for the applicant-petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Poswal, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. R. S. Mamli, Advocate
for respondent No. 2.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. CRM-12102-2024

Allowed as prayed, subject to all just exceptions. Copies of
zimini orders are taken on record as Annexure P-5 (*Colly.*)

2. CRM-M-1384-2024 (O&M)

The instant petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section
482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of order dated 11.04.2023, passed by the Judicial
Magistrate First Class, Shahabad in case titled as *Naibo Devi vs. Sandeep
Kumar and others*, arising out of Criminal Complaint bearing No. 25 of 2020,
filed under Sections 406, 498-A, 323, 506 and 34 of IPC, whereby the
petitioner had been declared a proclaimed person.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he has been falsely implicated in this case. The marriage between the petitioner and respondent No. 2 was solemnized on 07.04.2019. However, a matrimonial discord arose between them and respondent No. 2 left the company of the petitioner on 20.10.2020, consequent to which, he being a migrant labourer had shifted to Yamuna Nagar. Thereafter, after a period of about 02-03 years, when the petitioner visited his village on the occasion of Diwali festival, only then he came to know that respondent No. 2 had filed the aforesaid complaint against him and his family members. It is further submitted that due to the said reason, the petitioner was never served with the summons/warrants issued by the trial Court and had been declared a proclaimed person 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.

4. Learned counsel for respondent No. 2/complainant has opposed the prayer of the petitioner by submitting that there is no infirmity in the impugned order as the petitioner despite having due knowledge about the pendency of the aforesaid complaint has avoided his appearance before the trial Court. Therefore, he was rightly declared a proclaimed person. It is also submitted that vide order dated 06.12.2021, the passed by the Principal Judge, Family Court, Kurukshetra, the petitioner was directed to pay the maintenance amount of Rs. 5,000/- per month to respondent No. 2 but he is not paying the same to her. Hence, it is urged that the petition is liable to be dismissed.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have also gone through the material placed on record.

6. 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 11.04.2023 suffers from material illegalities and is liable to be quashed with all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom.

7. 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 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).”

8. 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.

9. 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 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 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.

10. 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 revealed that vide order dated 20.12.2022, since the non-bailable warrants against the petitioner were received back unexecuted, the trial Court ordered for initiation of proceedings under Section 82 of Cr.P.C. and publication of proclamation against the petitioner for 28.02.2023. Thereafter, on 31.01.2023, fresh proclamation against the petitioner was issued for 11.04.2023. However, a perusal of both the orders dated 20.12.2022 and 31.01.2023, passed by the trial Court ordering publication of proclamation against the petitioner, shows that before ordering for publication of proclamation, the trial Court has not recorded its satisfaction much less proper satisfaction that the petitioner had absconded or was concealing himself so that the warrant of arrest, previously issued, cannot be executed, despite reasonable diligence, which was in violation of the provisions of Section 82(1) of Cr.P.C. Reliance in this regard can be placed upon ***Rohit Kumar Vs. State of Delhi : 2008 Crl. J. 2561.***

11. Accordingly, in view of the discussion as made above, the present petition is allowed and the impugned order dated 11.04.2023, passed by the Judicial Magistrate First Class, Shahabad in case titled as ***Naibo Devi vs. Sandeep Kumar and others***, arising out of Criminal Complaint bearing No. 25 of 2020, filed under Sections 406, 498-A, 323, 506 and 34 of IPC, whereby the petitioner had been declared a proclaimed person, is quashed with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom.

12. However, the petitioner is directed to deposit a sum of Rs. 50,000/- as costs with the Registry of this Court within a period of one month from today, which will be disbursed to respondent No. 2/complainant on her moving an application in this regard.

13. The petitioner is further 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 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.

14. 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.

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

07.05.2024
Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes</i>