

2025 PHHC:043407



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

141

CRM-M-17403-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 01.04.2025

Tajinder Singh**...Petitioner****Versus****State of Punjab****...Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA**

Present:- Mr. Lakhwinder Singh Mann, Advocate
for the petitioner.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. 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 20.07.2004 (Annexure P-5), passed by the Court of learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, Nakodar in case titled as ***State vs. Amrik Singh and others***, arising out of FIR No. 355 dated 11.10.2001, registered under Sections 324, 148 and 149 of IPC at Police Station Nakodar, District Jalandhar, whereby the petitioner had been declared a proclaimed offender.

2. 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. After registration of the FIR, a compromise was effected between the parties and the petitioner, under a *bona fide* impression that he had been exonerated in the case, had gone abroad to earn livelihood. It is further argued that he was never served with any notice/warrants at his ordinary place of residence issued by the learned trial Court. Even otherwise, the petitioner had been declared a proclaimed offender

2025 PHHC:043407



without following the proper procedure prescribed under Section 82 of Cr.P.C. The petitioner is ready to join the Court proceedings. Hence, it is urged that the impugned order is liable to be set aside.

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

4. 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 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 20.07.2004 suffers from material illegalities and is liable to be quashed with all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom.

5. 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 05.04.2004, the learned trial Court had ordered for issuance of proclamation against the petitioner for 28.05.2004. 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 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 CrI. J. 2561.***

6. Further, a perusal of the statement of the serving police official 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

2025 PHHC:043407



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*.

7. The petitioner has taken a plea that he had gone abroad to earn his livelihood, which was in the notice of the complainant. However, no efforts whatsoever were made by the Court concerned to know about the address of the petitioner in abroad either from the complainant or from any other source, where the process could be sent to him. No letter to Ministry of External Affairs qua service of notice/warrants/proclamation against the petitioner is shown to have been written by the trial Court. As such, it can reasonably be presumed that the process never reached the petitioner and hence, he had no occasion to conceal himself. As such, the action of the trial Court by switching to the proclamation proceedings under Section 82 Cr.P.C. can itself be stated to be bad in the eyes of law. Reliance in this context can be placed upon *Manjit Kaur vs. State of Punjab : 2013 SCC Online (P&H) 8663*.

2025 PHHC:043407



8. 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 20.07.2004 (Annexure P-5), passed by the Court of learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, Nakodar in case titled as ***State vs. Amrik Singh and others***, arising out of FIR No. 355 dated 11.10.2001, registered under Sections 324, 148 and 149 of IPC at Police Station Nakodar, District Jalandhar, whereby the petitioner had been declared a proclaimed offender, is quashed with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom.

9. Keeping in view the fact that the petitioner is ready to join the Court proceedings which would obviously help in speedy conclusion of trial, he is directed to surrender before the learned trial Court within a period of 04 weeks from today and on doing so, the learned trial Court shall release him on bail, subject to his furnishing personal/surety bonds to its satisfaction.

10. Till the appearance of the petitioner before the learned trial Court, his arrest shall remain stayed.

11. It is made clear that in case the petitioner fails to appear before the learned trial Court within the stipulated time, this petition shall be deemed to be dismissed.

12. However, this relief shall be subject to payment of cost of Rs. 20,000/-, to be deposited by the petitioner with the District Legal Services Authority, Jalandhar.

01.04.2025

*Waseem Ansari***(MANISHA BATRA)**
JUDGE*Whether speaking/reasoned**Yes/No**Whether reportable**Yes/No*