



121 **IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-3433-2025

Date of decision: 23.01.2025

Gurjant Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Jashan Mehta, Advocate and
Mr. Sayyam Garg, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Subhash Godara, Addl.A.G., Punjab.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 528 of Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking quashing of order dated 03.01.2018
(Annexure P-4), whereby, the petitioner has been declared as proclaimed
offender in case bearing FIR No.65 dated 07.08.2014 under Sections
323/506/148/149 of IPC and Sections 25/24 of Arms Act, 1959 (Section 307 of
IPC was deleted and Sections 324/325/201 of IPC added later on) registered at
Police Station Sadar Rajpura, District Patiala (Annexure P-1).

2. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner *inter alia* contends
that the petitioner was regularly appearing through his counsel before the
learned trial Court. In the meanwhile, talks of settlement commenced between
the parties and an oral settlement was arrived and further, it was assured that
the said agreement ought to be reduced into writing and no proceedings shall be
pursued against the petitioner. Further, on the basis of aforesaid arrangement
and assurance, the petitioner left for abroad as he wanted to work and settle
there and since 21.03.2017, he has been working and residing abroad.



CRM-M-3433-2025

-2-

Thereafter, on 03.01.2018 (Annexure P-4), the petitioner has been declared as proclaimed offender. He further submits that now when the petitioner was returning to India, he came to know that the said compromise has not been reduced into writing for unknown reasons. He then contacted the respondents and got executed a compromise again dated 22.11.2024 and the same was duly reduced into writing. It is submitted that all the other accused persons has approached this Court by way of filing of CRM-M-39605-2018 titled as 'Hardeep Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and others' seeking quashing of FIR (*supra*) on the basis of compromise and the same was allowed vide order dated 06.10.2018 (Annexure P-7) passed by this Court. Aggrieved by the said impugned order dated 03.01.2018 (Annexure P-4), the petitioner has approached this Court by way of instant petition.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was never served with any summons and, therefore, the finding of the trial Court that the petitioner is intentionally evading his arrest, is erroneous. Ultimately, vide impugned order dated 03.01.2018 (Annexure P-4), the petitioner has been declared as proclaimed offender. It is contended that the impugned order is liable to be set aside on the ground that the mandate of Section 82 of Cr.P.C. has not been followed in its letter and spirit by the trial Court.

4. It is also submitted that the petitioner undertakes to appear before the trial Court on each and every date.

5. Notice of motion.

6. Mr. Subhash Godara, Addl.A.G., Punjab, who is present in Court, accepts notice for respondent No.1 and supports the order passed by the learned



trial Court by contending that the petitioner did not put in appearance before the trial Court intentionally and deliberately and, therefore, having left with no other option, proclamation was issued to secure his presence.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record of the case with their able assistance and with the consent of parties, the matter is taken up for final disposal.

8. While the scheme of criminal justice system necessitates curtailment of personal liberty to some extent, it is of the utmost importance that the same is done in line with the procedure established by law to maintain a healthy balance between personal liberty of the individual-accused and interests of the society in promoting law and order. Such procedure must be compatible with Article 21 of the Constitution of India i.e. it must be fair, just and not suffer from the vice of arbitrariness or unreasonableness.

9. A perusal of the impugned order reveals that the trial Court issued proclamation without recording reasons of its belief that the petitioner has absconded or is concealing himself. This Court in the judgment passed in ***Major Singh @ Major Vs. State of Punjab 2023 (3) RCR (Criminal) 406; 2023 (2) Law Herald 1506*** has held that the Court is first required to record its satisfaction before issuance of process under Section 82 of Cr.P.C. and non-recording of the satisfaction itself makes such order suffering from incurable illegality.

10. 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 himself come forward and has undertaken to

**CRM-M-3433-2025****-4-**

appear before the trial Court on each and every date.

11. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, the present petition is allowed, without issuing notice to respondents No.2 to 5 in order to save time of the Court and to avoid litigation expenses to be incurred on the part of respondents No.2 to 5 and the impugned order dated 03.01.2018 (Annexure P-4) vide which the petitioner was declared as proclaimed offender, is hereby set aside.

12. The petitioner is directed to appear before the trial Court within a period of two weeks from today and on his doing so, he shall be admitted to bail on his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court, along with costs of Rs.10,000/- to be deposited with the Poor Patient Welfare Fund, PGIMER, Chandigarh, for wasting precious time of the Court.

13. The receipt of payment of costs imposed must be presented before the learned trial Court. The learned Court below is directed to grant bail to the petitioner only upon verification of the payment of said costs.

14. However, in case, the petitioner fails to surrender before the learned trial Court within the stipulated time period, the interim protection granted by this Court, shall be deemed to be vacated.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

23.01.2025*Neha*

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No