



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

132

CRM-M-14707-2025

Decided on : 19.03.2025

Raja Singh Sidhu

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Balram Prashar, Advocate and
Mr. Sagar Bathla, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Amandeep Singh, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. By way of present petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C, petitioner is seeking quashing of order dated 19.05.2023 (Annexure P-8), passed by learned Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Gidderbaha, whereby the petitioner has been declared as proclaimed person in case FIR No. 130 dated 24.08.2018, under Sections 353,186, 148, 149 IPC and Section 3 of the Prevention of Damage to Public Property Act, 1984, registered at Police Station Gidderbaha, District Sri Muktsar Sahib alongwith proclamation notice dated 25.11.2022(P-6).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that after registration of FIR, petitioner was released on anticipatory bail by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sri Muktsar Sahib vide order dated 01.10.2018 (P-3). Thereafter, on 06.03.2021 final report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. was submitted, but never any notice or information was received by the petitioner regarding appearing before the concerned Court. Counsel further submits that petitioner left country on 07.02.2022 and started residing in Canada having permanent residency. Thereupon on 07.02.2025, when petitioner landed back in India, came to know about the fact that he has already been declared as Proclaimed Person vide impugned order dated 19.05.2023.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that as per instructions received by him, in consequence to declaring the petitioner Proclaimed Person, till date no FIR under Section 174-A IPC has been registered against him.

5. He further contends that, if one more opportunity is afforded to the petitioner to appear by granting some protection from arrest, he undertakes that in all the future proceedings of the present case, he would never be absent from the Court, except by obtaining prior permission from the Court, and thus will fully cooperate in the Court proceedings for early completion of trial.

6. Notice of motion.

7. On asking of the Court, Mr. Amandeep Singh, DAG, Punjab, who is present in Court, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

A copy of the complete paper book has been supplied to him by learned counsel for the petitioner.

8. Learned State counsel opposes the request of the petitioner, and submits that petitioner has willfully remained absent from the proceedings of learned Trial Court and thus, does not deserve any sympathy. Therefore, petitioner should be directed to surrender before the Court and to face trial.

9. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material on record. It is evident that petitioner is inclined to join the process of law, and by way of present petition, he is seeking one chance to join the proceedings before the learned Trial Court, by abiding to the terms and conditions.

10. 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



CRM-M-14707-2025

- 3 -

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 realized 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 *vis a vis* 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***



CRM-M-14707-2025

- 4 -

on 16.01.2025).

11. 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 19.05.2023(Annexure P-8) is set aside to the extent of declaring the petitioner as ‘proclaimed person’, and he is directed to be released on bail, in the eventuality of surrender by him before the trial Court on or before 05.04.2025.

12. 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.

13. However, this order shall be subject to the payment of Rs.20,000/- (Rupees twenty thousand only) as costs, to be deposited by the petitioner in an Old Age Home of the area, as may be decided by the learned Trial Court. The Trial Court shall also specify the time frame within which such costs will be required to be deposited, but not more than two weeks, failing which this order would not be of any advantage to the petitioner.

14. With aforementioned terms, present petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

March 19, 2025

rashmi

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