



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH.**

CRM-M-45303-2023

Date of Decision:-10.09.2025

Ramesh Kumar.

.....Petitioner.

Vs.

State of Haryana & Anr.

.....Respondents.

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present:- Mr. Brijender Kaushik, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mr. Vipul Sherwal, AAG Haryana.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J.(ORAL)

The prayer in the present petition under Section 482 Cr.PC is for quashing of the order dated 20.04.2012 (Annexure P-17) passed by JMIC, Panchkula declaring the petitioner as proclaimed person in case no.NACT 3101167 of 2008 titled as Sudha Aggarwal Vs. Ramesh Kumar and its consequential and all the subsequent orders arising therefrom.

On 12.09.2023 the following order was passed:-

“ Inter alia contends that learned Court below erred in declaring petitioner as proclaimed person as he was not residing at the address provided by the complainant. He further submits that neither any notice nor summons were ever served upon the petitioner.

Notice of motion.

On advance service of copy of petition, learned State counsel appears and accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State of Haryana and seeks time to file report with regard to antecedents of the petitioner.



Adjourned to 13.12.2023.

In the meantime, petitioner is directed to appear before learned trial Court within one week from today and on his causing appearance, he shall be released on bail on furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to its satisfaction.”

Thereafter on 13.12.2023⁴ the following order was passed:-

“ In compliance with the previous order dated 12.9.2023, the petitioner has caused appearance before the learned trial court concerned and has been released on regular bail.

Notice to the respondent no. 2 could not be issued, as the process fee has not been filed. Learned counsel for the petitioner seeks another opportunity to file the process fee. In case the process fee is filed within two days from today, notice to respondent no. 2 be issued for 29.2.2024.”

The Counsel for the petitioner contends that in deference to the aforementioned orders the petitioner surrendered on 18.09.2023 and was granted the concession of bail. He has faced the Trial and has been acquitted. Therefore, the impugned order be quashed. Though the petitioner was to file fresh process fee as per the order dated 13.12.2023, he has not done so.

The Counsel for the State does not dispute the fact that the petitioner has surrendered, faced Trial and has been acquitted.

I have heard counsel for the parties.

It is admitted that the petitioner was declared a proclaimed person in the captioned criminal complaint. Pursuant to the interim orders of this Court, he surrendered, was granted bail and on conclusion of the Trial he came to be acquitted vide judgment dated 02.05.2024 by the court of Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Kalka.



In view of the above, no useful purpose would be served by permitting the proceedings emanating out of the impugned order to continue. Therefore, the present petition is allowed and the order dated 20.04.2012 (Annexure P-17) declaring the petitioner a proclaimed person and all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom stands quashed.

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

September 10, 2025
Vinay

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