



CRM-M-47336-2025

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

132

CRM-M-47336-2025(O & M)

Date of decision: 28.08.2025

Vinit Kumar

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Saurabh Dalal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. B.S.Saroha, DAG, Haryana.

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer made in the present petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023, for quashing of order dated 24.01.2025, Annexure P-5, in complaint case No.NACT-1417 dated 16.07.2022, passed by learned Judicial Magistrate, Rohtak, whereby the petitioner has been declared as a proclaimed person.

2. Learned counsel submits that the petitioner is residing at the address, as stated in the petition, since July 2022 onwards, whilst the proclamation was issued at the address which he had left even before filing the complaint under Section 138 NI Act, whereupon he was declared a proclaimed person, vide the said order, as has been impugned in the present case, therefore, the provisions of Section 82 Cr.P.C cannot be said to have been complied with in letter and spirit. It was, as a matter of fact, incumbent upon respondent No.2-complainant to have given the

CRM-M-47336-2025

correct address of the petitioner as the same could have been obtained from his bank. His absence is neither wilful nor deliberate and on account of the reason aforesaid. Further that, the case before the trial Court is fixed for 20.09.2025; he is ready and willing to join the proceedings and it is prayed that one opportunity may be granted to him to surrender before the learned trial Court. To buttress his submission, reliance is placed on the judgments of this Court in **Gurbir Singh Mundi vs. State of Punjab and another** CRM-M-49283-2021, decided on 16.12.2021.

3. Learned State counsel submits that the petitioner has rightly been declared proclaimed person for having absented.

4. No order prejudicial to the rights of respondent No.2 is being proposed to be passed by this Court, thus, there is no requirement of effecting service upon him.

5. In the case of **Gurbir Singh Mundi** (supra), it was held that provisions of Section 82(2) Cr.PC. are to be mandatorily complied with cumulatively and not alternatively. The Court had quashed the order declaring the petitioner therein as proclaimed person on the ground that declaration was not read publicly in some conspicuous place of town or village, in which the accused ordinarily resides.

6. Heard.

7. The very purpose of initiation of proclamation proceedings, is to compel and secure the presence of the accused to face trial and establish the rule of law, as also to ensure finalization of the proceedings.

8. The present petition has been filed on 25.08.2025 and case

CRM-M-47336-2025

before the trial Court is fixed for 20.09.2025, which reflects the *bona fide* of the petitioner to join the proceedings.

9. Adverting to the facts of the present case, the reasons for non-appearance of the petitioner that led to the passing of the impugned order, appear to be justified. At times, the accused can be prevented by sufficient reasons to put an appearance before the Court and such an absence cannot necessarily be construed as deliberate and wilful. However, it is incumbent upon him to join the proceedings, before the trial Court, for the culmination of the same. Considering the fact that the absence of the petitioner was not wilful or deliberate and his readiness and willingness to surrender and join the proceedings, in case one opportunity is granted to the petitioner, no prejudice shall be caused to any of the parties, rather his joining the proceedings would help in expediting the trial. This Court in light of the judgment referred to above being applicable to the instant case, finds that the ends of justice would be adequately met if the present petition is allowed.

10. In view of the afore-mentioned judgment and the facts and circumstances of the case, the impugned order dated 24.01.2025, Annexure P-5, is set aside, subject to surrender by the petitioner before the trial Court on or before 16.09.2025. On furnishing bail/surety bonds, the trial Court shall release him on bail subject to its satisfaction. He is also directed to furnish an undertaking by way of an affidavit that he will appear on each and every date of hearing before the trial Court, unless specifically exempted by the Court. He shall not leave the country without

CRM-M-47336-2025

prior permission of the Court. The trial Court may impose any other condition that it may deem appropriate in the facts and circumstances of the present case.

11. Before parting with this order, it is made abundantly clear that in case the petitioner does not adhere to the aforesaid, the present petition shall be deemed to have been dismissed without any reference to this Court.

28.08.2025

parveen kumar

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

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