



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

277

**CRM-M-28877-2023 (O&M)
Date of decision: 28.04.2025**

Suresh Kumar

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Supneet Singh, Advocate for
Mr. P.S.Dhaliwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.


Mr. Ramesh Kumar Ambavta, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Amit Siwach, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of order dated 24.02.2023 passed by learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Sonipat in criminal complaint filed under Section 138 r/w Section 142 of Negotiable Instruments Act and Section 420 IPC, vide which the petitioner was declared as proclaimed person.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that after filing of aforesaid complaint in the year 2017, notices could not be served upon the petitioner till 22.09.2022. Further, non-bailable warrants were issued against the petitioner for 25.11.2022, which were received back unexecuted due to incomplete address. Thereafter, the petitioner was summoned through proclamation under Section 82 Cr.PC for 20.01.2023. Subsequently, the petitioner was declared as proclaimed person vide impugned order dated



24.02.2023. Aggrieved by the said impugned order, the petitioner has approached this Court by way of instant petition. It is contended that the impugned order is liable to be set aside on the ground that the mandate of Section 82 of Cr.P.C. has not been followed in its letter and spirit by the trial Court. Lastly, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner undertakes to appear before the trial Court on each and every date of hearing.

3. Learned State counsel assisted by counsel for respondent No.2 supports the order passed by the learned trial Court by contending that the petitioner did not put in appearance before the learned trial Court intentionally and deliberately and, therefore, having left with no other option, the proclamation was issued to secure his presence.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record of the case with their able assistance and with the consent of parties, the matter is taken up for final disposal.

5. While the scheme of criminal justice system necessitates curtailment of personal liberty to some extent, it is of the utmost importance that the same is done in line with the procedure established by law to maintain a healthy balance between personal liberty of the individual-accused and interests of the society in promoting law and order. Such procedure must be compatible with Article 21 of the Constitution of India i.e. it must be fair, just and not suffer from the vice of arbitrariness or unreasonableness.

6. A perusal of the impugned order reveals that the trial Court issued proclamation without recording reasons of its belief that the petitioner



has absconded or is concealing himself. This Court in the judgment passed in ***Major Singh @ Major Vs. State of Punjab 2023 (3) RCR (Criminal) 406; 2023 (2) Law Herald 1506*** has held that the Court is first required to record its satisfaction before issuance of process under Section 82 of Cr.P.C. and non-recording of the satisfaction itself makes such order suffering from incurable illegality.

7. The sole purpose of issuance of non-bailable warrants or issuance of proclamation is to secure presence of the accused before the trial Court. The petitioner in the present case has himself come forward and has undertaken to appear before the learned trial Court on each and every date of hearing.

8. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, the present petition is allowed and the impugned order dated 24.02.2023, vide which the petitioner was declared proclaimed person as well as all the consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, are hereby set-aside.

9. The petitioner is directed to appear before the learned trial Court within a period of 02 weeks from today and on doing so, he shall be admitted to bail on furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court, along with costs of Rs.10,000/- to be deposited with PGIMER Poor Patient Welfare Fund, Chandigarh, for wasting precious time of the Court.

11. The receipt of payment of costs imposed upon the petitioner must be presented before learned trial Court. Learned Court below is directed to grant bail to the petitioner only upon verification of the payment of said costs.



12. However, in case, the petitioner fails to surrender before the learned trial Court within the stipulated time period, the interim protection granted by this Court, shall be deemed to be vacated.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

28.04.2025
sonia

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether reportable:	Yes/No