

2025:PHHC:044026



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

144

CRM-M-17570-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 01.04.2025

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

Present:- Mr. Amandeep Singh Sandhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Ruchika Sabherwal, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 528 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for quashing of order dated 04.03.2025 (Annexure P-5), passed by the Court of learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, Mansa in case titled as ***State vs. Jasdev Singh***, arising out of FIR No. 94 dated 24.07.2019, registered under Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station City 2 Mansa, District Mansa, whereby the petitioner had been declared a proclaimed person.

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. Initially, he was found innocent during investigation but vide order dated 18.09.2024, passed by the learned trial Court, he has now been summoned as an additional accused on allowing an application filed under Section 319 of Cr.P.C. However, the petitioner had left India for Canada on 17.06.2024 i.e. much prior to passing of aforesaid summoning order. He was not aware about pendency of the aforementioned

2025.PHHC.044026



trial against him as he was never served at his ordinary place of residence with any notice/warrants issued by the learned trial Court. Even otherwise, the petitioner had been declared a proclaimed person without following the proper procedure prescribed under Section 82 of Cr.P.C. He is ready to join the Court proceedings. Hence, it is urged that the impugned order is liable to be set aside.

3. Learned Senior Deputy Advocate General, Punjab has argued that the petitioner was having knowledge about the pendency of the trial and had intentionally avoided his appearance before the learned trial Court. Therefore, he had been rightly declared a proclaimed person. Hence, it is urged that the petition is liable to be dismissed.

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

5. 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 person, I am of the considered opinion that the impugned order dated 04.03.2025 suffers from material illegalities and is liable to be quashed with all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom.

6. 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 20.01.2025, 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 28.02.2025. A bare perusal of this order shows

2025.PHHC.044026



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 Crl. J. 2561.***

7. Further, a perusal of order dated 08.11.2024, passed by the learned trial Court, reveals that it was in the knowledge of it that the petitioner had gone abroad six months back. However, no efforts whatsoever were made by the Court concerned to know about the address of the petitioner in abroad, 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.***

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 04.03.2025 (Annexure P-5), passed by the Court of learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, Mansa in case titled as ***State vs. Jasdev Singh***, arising out of FIR No. 94 dated 24.07.2019, registered under Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station City 2

2025.PHHC.044028



Mansa, District Mansa, whereby the petitioner had been declared a proclaimed person, 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 06 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. 10,000/-, to be deposited by the petitioner with the District Legal Services Authority, Mansa.

01.04.2025

Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No