



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

121

**CRM-M-35674-2025
Decided on : 22.08.2025**

Lovepreet Singh @ Lavi

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH**PRESENT:** Mr. Tanvir Joshi, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG, Haryana.
(appears on advance notice).

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. By way of present petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C, petitioner is seeking quashing of order dated 28.11.2023 (Annexure P-5), passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sirsa, whereby the petitioner has been declared as proclaimed person in case FIR No. 241 dated 28.11.2020, under Section 15 of NDPS Act, 1985, registered at Police Station Nathu Sarai Chopta, District Sirsa.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that after registration of the FIR, the petitioner was granted regular bail by this Hon'ble Court vide order dated 08.04.2021 passed in CRM-M-5614-2021. It is further submitted that the petitioner has been regularly appearing before the learned trial Court and the challan in the case was presented on 16.01.2021. However, petitioner, who is a truck driver by profession, had gone to Himachal Pradesh for earning his livelihood and inadvertently missed the hearing scheduled on 31.01.2022, as a result of which his bail bonds were cancelled by the learned trial Court. Subsequently, vide order dated 28.11.2023, petitioner was declared a proclaimed person

3. He further contends that, if one more opportunity is afforded to the



petitioner to appear before learned trial Court by granting protection from arrest, he also 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 trial Court proceedings for early completion of the trial.

4. Notice of motion.

5. On asking of the Court, Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG, Haryana, 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.

6. 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 trial Court and to face trial.

7. 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.

8. 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 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 on 16.01.2025)***.

9. 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

**CRM-M-35674-2025****- 4 -**

may restart and continue in smooth manner. Accordingly, plea of the petitioner is accepted. Impugned order dated 28.11.2023(Annexure P-5) 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 08.09.2025.

10. 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.

11. However, this order shall be subject to the payment of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten 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.

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

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

22 August, 2025*rashmi*

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