



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

128

CRM-M-9690-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 12.03.2025

Atma Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Mr. H. S. Dhindsa, Advocate
for the applicant-petitioner.

Ms. Ruchika Sabherwal, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Rahul Balana, Advocate
for respondent No.2/complainant.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. CRM-10027-2025

Allowed as prayed for.

Amended memo of parties is taken on record. Office to tag the
same at appropriate place in the file.

2. CRM-10028-2025

Allowed as prayed for.

Documents are taken on record.

3. CRM-10029-2025

Prayer in this application is for preponing the main case, which is
fixed for 25.03.2025.

For the reasons stated in the application, the same is allowed. The
main case is preponed and taken up today itself.

2025:PHHC:035567



4. CRM-M-9690-2025 (O&M)

The instant petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 528 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (*for short 'BNSS'*) for quashing of order dated 13.01.2025 (Annexure P-4), passed by the Court of learned Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Rajpura in case titled as ***State of Punjab vs. Tarlok Singh etc.***, arising out of FIR No. 302 dated 20.11.2017, registered under Section 420 of IPC at Police Station City Rajpura, District Patiala, whereby the petitioner had been declared a proclaimed offender.

5. 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 the aforementioned case. The petitioner was granted concession of anticipatory bail and was regularly appearing before the learned trial Court. However, on 22.10.2024, he could not appear before the Court due to medical reasons and some miscommunication with his counsel resulting into cancellation of his bail and ultimately declaring him as a proclaimed offender. It is further submitted that the petitioner had been declared a proclaimed offender without following the proper procedure prescribed under Section 82 of Cr.P.C. Even otherwise, the matter stands amicably settled between the petitioner and respondent No. 2/complainant and in pursuance of the same, the petitioner had paid the entire disputed amount to respondent No. 2 and the petitioner will shortly file a petition before this Court seeking quashing of the FIR in question on the basis of the said compromise. Hence, it is urged that the impugned order is liable to be set aside.

6. Learned State counsel has argued that there is no infirmity or illegality in the impugned order as the petitioner had intentionally avoided his

2025:PHHC:035567



appearance before the learned trial Court. Hence, it is urged that the petition is liable to be dismissed.

7. On the other hand, learned counsel for respondent No. 2/complainant has admitted the factum of compromise having arrived at between the parties and also that the entire disputed amount has been paid to him by the petitione. He has also submitted that he has no objection if the present petition is allowed and the impugned order is quashed in favour of the petitioner.

8. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and have also gone through the material placed on record.

9. 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 learned trial Court from the date of initiating proceedings under Section 82 of 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 13.01.2025 suffers from material illegalities and is liable to be quashed with all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom.

10. After going through the material placed on record as well as the copies of zimni orders passed by the learned trial Court, it is revealed that on 02.12.2024, 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 13.01.2025. A bare perusal of this order shows that the learned trial Court before ordering for publication of proclamation has not recorded its proper satisfaction that that the petitioner had absconded or was concealing himself so that the warrant of arrest, previously issued, cannot

2025:PHHC:035567



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. Further, a perusal of the statement of the serving police official ASI Charan Singh reveals that the proclamation was not read over in some conspicuous place of the town or village in which the petitioner was supposed to be residing. As per Section 82 (2) of 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. Reliance in this regard can be placed upon ***Pawan Kumar Gupta Vs. The State of W.B. : 1973 CriLJ 1368.***

12. 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 13.01.2025 (Annexure P-4), passed by the Court of learned Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Rajpura in case titled as ***State of Punjab vs. Tarlok Singh etc.***, arising out of FIR No. 302 dated 20.11.2017, registered under Section 420 of IPC at Police Station City Rajpura, District Patiala, whereby the petitioner had been declared a

2025:PHHC:035567



proclaimed offender, is quashed with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom.

13. 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. 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 learned trial Court, his arrest shall remain stayed.

16. It is made clear that in case the petitioner fails to appear before the learned trial Court within a period of four weeks from today, this petition shall be deemed to be dismissed.

12.03.2025

Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No