



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

137

CRM-M-12605-2025
Decided on : 06.03.2025

Sandeep Singh @ Ghugg @ Sandeep Kumar
... Petitioner(s)
Versus
State of Punjab and others
... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Ms. Navjot Kaur, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Amandeep Singh, DAG, Punjab

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Instant petition, under Section 528 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 482 Cr.P.C.), has been filed for quashing of the order dated 09.03.2012 (Annexure P-3), whereby the petitioner has been declared as ‘proclaimed offender’, on account of his non-appearance in the following FIR:-

FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
67	07.10.2008	160, 148, 149, 506 of IPC	Dhilwan	Kapurthala

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that present petitioner, namely Sandeep Singh @ Ghugg @ Sandeep Kumar and his co-accused – Gurpreet Singh, were declared as ‘proclaimed offenders’, vide order dated 09.03.2012 (P-3), which says as under:-

“ On 1.3.2012 HC Tarlochan Singh No. 1352 had appeared and vide his statement has proved the execution of proclamation process against the accused Sandeep Singh and Gurpreet Singh on 4.2.2012. More than 30 days have passed since then, however, none has appeared on behalf of the accused Sandeep Singh and Gurpreet Singh. Accordingly, accused Sandeep Singh and Gurpreet Singh are declared as proclaimed offender. Intimation be sent to the SHO, P.S. Dhilwan, Kapurthala, for the necessary action. Now unexamined prosecution witnesses be now summoned for 14.6.2012.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that co-accused – Gurpreet Singh, had later on joined the proceedings in the trial, and thereupon, vide judgment dated 12.08.2014, all 08 accused persons were acquitted.

Further submits that till date, neither petitioner has joined the proceedings at the time when the trial against other accused was pending, nor there is any registration of any criminal case against him u/s 174-A of IPC in pursuance of the order 09.03.2012 (P-3). However, now the petitioner wishes to join the process of law.

3. Learned counsel further submits that otherwise also, dispute with the complainant/victim has been resolved by executing a compromise dated 03.10.2023 (P-5).

Thus learned counsel submits that in case one opportunity is granted for releasing the petitioner on bail, by protecting him from arrest, petitioner undertakes that he would not absent himself in future without there being prior permission from the Court, and would fully cooperate for early disposal of the trial.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Learned State counsel puts an appearance, and opposes the request of the petitioner by submitting that petitioner does not deserve any sympathy, because, he knowingly evade the proceedings before the trial Court. Learned State counsel further submits that looking at his behaviour, there is no surety that in future, petitioner would not be absent for the purpose of delaying the trial.

6. In number of cases, wherein, accused stopped appearing in criminal cases, the Courts are compelled to declare accused as 'Proclaimed Person/Proclaimed Offender'. After examining the facts, this Court has formulated a uniform method to ensure the presence of accused before the concerned Court, to enable it to proceed further instead of delaying the proceedings by awaiting the presence of accused.

Intentional or unintentional default of the accused can be dealt with by examining the facts from case to case involved, and where it is realised that absence or prolonged absence of such accused is intentional to evade the process of law, he/she can be penalized examining the nature of crime in which he is facing the proceedings and thereupon by imposing some

cost amount subject to his/her capacity to pay.

Primary object of every Court is only to examine the commission of crime in question before it *viz-a-viz* the person/accused, who is subjected to such proceedings, and if possible justice be imparted at the earliest without unnecessary delay. It is not expected that undue time would be devoted in securing the presence of absconded accused and also to waste energy by enforcing the special mechanism to arrest such accused.

Considering all such aspects, this Court in the case of ***Ashish Kumar Honda @ Ashish Handa Vs. State of Punjab, 2022 (4) RCR (criminal) 765; Law Finder Doc Id # 20238111*** considered similar plea of appearance, expressed at the instance of the accused, who failed to appear before the Court at appropriate time, and observed that:

“paramount consideration of the Court is to secure presence of accused on each and every date for speeding up the trial for its final conclusion. Already Courts are flooded with so much litigation, resulting in slow pace of work, because of more than one reason. The required energy and manpower be used for expediting the proceedings of the Court, instead of running after the accused persons to get hold of them.”

Again, this Court has considered the aforementioned similar plea in case ***Veena @ Veena Devi v. State of Punjab (CRM-M-2206-2025, decided on 16.01.2025.***

7. I have considered the submissions of both the sides and examined the relevant material available on record. The petitioner has remiss in appearing before the Court, due to which on 09.03.2012, impugned order declaring the petitioner ‘proclaimed offender’ has been passed against him. It also cannot be left unnoticed that as and when the petitioner came to know about passing of the impugned order, the petitioner has moved the present petition, showing his inclination to submit himself before the trial Court.

8. In totality of circumstances, I am of the view that the petitioner can be given one chance to appear before the trial Court, so that proceedings may restart and continue in smooth manner. Accordingly, plea of the petitioner is accepted. Impugned order dated 09.03.2012 (P-3) is **set aside** to the extent of declaring the petitioner as ‘proclaimed offender’, and he is directed to be released on bail, in the eventuality of surrender by him before the trial Court on or before 21.03.2025.

The petitioner shall also furnish fresh bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court. Besides, petitioner would also submit

specific undertaking/affidavit that he will keep appearing during the proceedings of the trial in future and the proceedings would not be delayed because of his conduct.

9. **With aforementioned terms, present petition stands disposed of.**

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

March 06, 2025

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*
Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*