



CRM-M-10043-2024

1

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

129

CRM-M-10043-2024

Date of decision: 30.10.2025

Sukhbir Singh @ Monu

...Petitioner

V/s

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Gurmohan Singh Bedi, Advocate with
Mr. Pawandeep Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Amit Goyal, Additional Advocate General, Punjab.

SUMEET GOEL, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C., 1973, seeking quashing of order dated 10.03.2012 (Annexure P-5) passed by the Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Batala whereby the petitioner was declared proclaimed person in case FIR No.164 dated 09.12.2006 registered under Sections 326, 452, 323, 427, 506, 148, 149 and 120-B of IPC at Police Station Shri Hargobindpur, District Batala as also all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has iterated that the impugned order whereby the petitioner has been declared a proclaimed offender is wholly illegal, arbitrary and unsustainable in the eyes of law. Learned counsel has further iterated that the proclamation proceedings are vitiated as the requirement of giving mandatory notice period of 30 days as required under Section 82 of Cr.P.C. was not adhered to. According to learned counsel, the proclamation was allegedly executed on 27.12.2011



CRM-M-10043-2024

2

directing the petitioner to appear on 02.01.2012 thereby not granting the requisite period of 30 days. Learned counsel has further submitted that instead of issuing a fresh proclamation in compliance with the statutory mandate, the Court below subsequently adjourned the matter to 10.03.2012 without issuing any fresh proclamation for that date. It has been submitted that the declaration of the petitioner as a proclaimed offender vide impugned order dated 10.03.2012 is contrary to the provisions of Section 82 of Cr.P.C. According to learned counsel, such a course of action is contrary to the settled position of law as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in case titled as *Ashok Kumar vs. State of Haryana and another, 2013(4) RCR (Criminal) 550*, wherein it has been categorically held that the proclamation must itself provide a clear notice period of not less than 30 days from the date of its publication and the defect cannot be cured by mere adjournment. Furthermore, the proclamation proceedings were initiated without first executing or attempting to execute warrants of arrest which is a *sine qua non* for invoking Section 82 of Cr.P.C. It has been argued that before issuing a proclamation, the Court must have a reason to believe that the accused has absconded or is concealing himself so that the warrants cannot be executed, which condition is not satisfied in the present case. Learned counsel has prayed that the impugned order dated 10.03.2012 declaring the petitioner as a proclaimed person are procedurally defective, contrary to Section 82 of Cr.P.C. and therefore, liable to be quashed alongwith all consequential proceedings arising therefrom.

3. Referring to the short reply filed by way of an affidavit of

**CRM-M-10043-2024****3**

Hargobindpur, Police District Batala on behalf of the State of Punjab, learned State counsel has reiterated the submissions made therein and opposed the present petition. While refuting the case set up by the petitioner, detailed arguments were advanced on merits, contending that the offence alleged against the petitioner is serious in nature and that the investigation was conducted in a fair and proper manner. Furthermore, it has been submitted by the learned State counsel that during the course of trial, the petitioner could not appear before the Court below on 04.11.2011 and accordingly the bail bonds and surety bonds of the petitioner were forfeited to the State and non-bailable warrants were issued for 28.11.2011. Thereafter on 02.01.2012, the Court below recorded that the proclamation issued against the petitioner was received as duly served but he did not appear which compelled the Court below to declare him proclaimed offender vide impugned order. Instead of surrendering before the competent Court, the petitioner has chose to file the instant petition which clearly reflects his conduct that he was fully aware of the proceedings and the coercive measures undertaken by the Court below to secure his presence. Moreover, it has been stated that the learned Court below followed the procedure as laid-down under Section 82 of the Cr.P.C., 1973 in letter and spirit and no discrepancy whatsoever is forthcoming from the records of the case. Accordingly, dismissal of the instant petition has been prayed for.

4. I have heard the learned counsel for the rival parties and carefully perused the record of the case.

5. The law is well settled that no person can be declared a proclaimed offender/person unless the procedure prescribed under Section



82 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 is meticulously adhered to. It is trite law that the provisions of Section 82 are mandatory in nature, and any non-compliance thereof vitiates the entire proceedings. Furthermore, Section 82(1) of the Cr.P.C. clearly provides that before issuing a proclamation requiring a person to appear, the Court must have reason to believe that such person has absconded or is concealing himself so that the warrant cannot be executed. Further, the proclamation must specify a date not less than 30 days from the date of publication for the accused to appear before the Court. In the present case, the record reflects that the summons and warrants were returned unserved and there is no finding that the petitioner was evading service. In the present case, the proclamation was effected on 27.12.2011 for appearance on 02.01.2012 thereby granting only notice of 06 days, which is contrary to the mandate of Section 82 of Cr.P.C. Furthermore, no fresh proclamation was issued for appearance of the accused-petitioner on 10.03.2012 when the impugned order declaring the petitioner as a proclaimed offender was passed which is not shown to have been in conformity with Section 82 of the Cr.P.C. In the considered opinion of this Court, clear notice period of not less than 30 days from the date of its publication must be provided in the proclamation itself. The same legal principle squarely applies in the present case.

6. This Court finds the course adopted by the Court below is antithesis to the provisions of Section 82 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973. The Court below has committed illegality by issuing the said proclamation under Section 82 of the Criminal Procedure Code, 1973,



below, while declaring the petitioner as proclaimed offender, failed to satisfy itself regarding due execution of proclamation and proceeded in a mechanical manner. Such an order being violative of mandatory provisions of law, cannot be sustained. Section 82 of the Criminal Procedure Code, 1973 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 Sections 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 sub-section (1).J”

7. A Coordinate Bench of this Court while dealing with invocation of the provision of Section 82 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, against an accused in the case of ‘**Sonu v. State of Haryana, 2021(1) RCR (Criminal) 319**’, held as under:

“9. The essential requirements of section 82 of the Cr.P.C., 1973 for issuance and publication of proclamation against an absconder and declaring him as proclaimed person/offender 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. (See Rohit Kumar v. State of Delhi: 2008 CrI. J. 2561).

(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., 1973. (See Rohit Kumar v. State of Delhi : 2008 CrI. J. 2561).

(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. (See Bishundayal Mahton and others v. Emperor : AIR 1943 Patna 366 and Devender Singh Negi v. State of U.P. : 1994 CrI LJ (Allahabad HC) 1783).

(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. (See Gurappa Gugal and others v. State of Mysore : 1969 CriLJ 826 and Shokat Ali v. State of Haryana : 2020(2) RCR (CRIMINAL) 339).



(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. (See *Dilbagh Singh v. State of Punjab (P&H) : 2015 (8) RCR (CRIMINAL) 166* and *Ashok Kumar v. State of Haryana and another : 2013 (4) RCR (CRIMINAL) 550*)

(vi) The Proclamation has to be published in the manner laid down in section 82(2) of the Cr.P.C., 1973. 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., 1973 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. (See *Pawan Kumar Gupta v. The State of W.B. : 1973 CriLJ 1368*). 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. (See *Birad Dan v. State: 1958 CriLJ 965*).

(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., 1973. 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. (See *Birad Dan v. State: 1958 CriLJ 965*).



(xi) The conditions specified in section 82(2) of the Cr.P.C., 1973 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. (See Devendra Singh Negi alias Debu v. State of U.P. and another: 1994 CriLJ 1783 and Pal Singh v. The State: 1955 CriLJ 318)."

8. It is pertinent to mention that it is by now a settled principle of law that before issuing a proclamation under Section 82 Cr.P.C., the Court must record its satisfaction that the accused, against whom the proclamation is sought to be issued, is absconding or concealing himself with intent to evade arrest. This foundational requirement is conspicuously absent in the present case. A perusal of the impugned order dated 10.03.2012 reflects that no such satisfaction was recorded by the Court below nor was there any material to justify the inference that the petitioner had absconded or was deliberately avoiding arrest. Furthermore, the issuance of non-bailable warrants and proclamation without establishing proper service of earlier process(s) shows non-compliance with the due process of law, resulting in serious prejudice to the petitioner.

9. The provisions of Section 82 of the Code of Criminal Procedure having serious ramifications qua the right of the accused concerning his presence in the criminal trial proceedings ought not be and cannot be invoked in casual and cavalier manner. The requirement of recording of satisfaction, that the accused has absconded or is concealing himself so that warrant of his arrest cannot be executed, as embodied in Section 82 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, is to be scrupulously complied with based on relevant material available on record of the case in



that regard. Non-adherence to said requirement while declaring the accused as proclaimed person vitiates the proclamation proceedings initiated against the accused.

10. Hence, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the criminal proceedings pending against the petitioner, particularly when the petitioner has already joined the investigation and duly cooperated. It is, therefore, an appropriate case for the exercise of powers under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. and to bring to an end the criminal proceedings initiated in the light of the FIR *ibid* against the petitioner.

11. In view of the above findings, in the entirety of facts and circumstances of the present case, the present petition is allowed and the order dated 10.03.2012 (Annexure P-5) passed by the Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Batala whereby the petitioner was declared proclaimed person in case FIR No.164 dated 09.12.2006 registered under Sections 326, 452, 323, 427, 506, 148, 149 and 120-B of IPC at Police Station Shri Hargobindpur, District Batala as well as the other consequential proceedings arising therefrom are quashed.

12. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of accordingly.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

October 30, 2025
Ajay

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