

136

CRM-M-58538-2025 (O&M)

-1-



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-58538-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 19.11.2025

LOVEPREET SINGH

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

....Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present:- Mr. Angad Chahal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

.....

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J. (ORAL)

CRM-45244-2025

Keeping in view the averments made in the application, the documents are taken on record as Annexures P-9 to P-13 subject to all just exceptions.

Registry to tag the same at appropriate place.

Disposed of.

Main Case

1. The present petition has been preferred under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, assailing the impugned order dated 24.11.2022 (Annexure P-6), whereby the learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, Batala has declared the petitioner as a proclaimed person and further the petitioner be released on bail during the pendency of the trial.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that FIR No.28 dated 11.04.2021 u/s 420 IPC was registered at P.S. Shri Hargobindpur, Police District Batala, District Gurdaspur. He submits that anticipatory bail of the



petitioner was dismissed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Gurdaspur on 12.05.2021. The petitioner also applied for grant of anticipatory bail before this Hon'ble High Court and due to Covid-19 the application was not pressed at that stage. He submits that in the meanwhile the petitioner had applied for a job in Sweden and accordingly he left India on 17.10.2021. He further submits that due to non-appearance of the petitioner before the learned Trial Court he was declared proclaimed person vide order dated 24.11.2022 (Annexure P-6).

3. He further argues that since petitioner was never served with any notice/warrant, hence, the impugned order has been passed without complying with the requirements of section 82 Cr.P.C. (section 84 BNSS). He further submits that the petitioner undertakes to appear before the trial Court on each and every date of hearing. Hence, he prays for quashing of the said order.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Ravinder Singh, DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State and supports the impugned order, contending that the petitioner deliberately avoided appearance, leaving the trial Court with no option but to issue proclamation to secure his presence.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

7. The object behind issuance of non-bailable warrants or proclamation is only to secure the presence of the accused. In the present case, the petitioner has voluntarily approached this Court and undertaken to appear before the trial Court regularly.



8. The determination of whether the default of an accused is intentional or unintentional must be made on a case-by-case basis, taking into account the specific facts and circumstances of each case. Where it is established that the absence, or prolonged absence, of the accused is deliberate and intended to evade the process of law, appropriate costs may be imposed after considering the nature of the offence and the capacity of the accused to pay any cost.

9. In the present case, apart from a bald assertion that requirements of Section 82 Cr.P.C. were not complied with before declaring petitioner a Proclaimed person, no plausible ground has been raised by the learned counsel for the petitioner to support his contention. However, still this court is inclined in taking a lenient view keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case in hand.

10. In view of the foregoing discussion, the petition is allowed. The impugned order dated 24.11.2022 (Annexure P-6), declaring the petitioner proclaimed person, is set aside and the petitioner is directed to appear before the trial Court within four weeks from today, subject to payment of Rs.20,000/- as costs to be deposited by the petitioner in Punjab State Legal Services Authority-Disaster Relief Fund, Account No.44426937384, IFSC: SBIN0014656, State Bank of India, Sector 68, SAS Nagar, Mohali. Upon doing so, he shall be released on bail subject to furnishing requisite bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court.



11. Besides, petitioner shall also file an undertaking/affidavit that he will appear in all future proceedings of the trial and proceedings shall not be delayed because of his conduct.

12. It is made clear that in case, petitioner fails to appear before the trial court within the stipulated period, this order shall be deemed to be vacated.

19.11.2025
puneet

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

i)	Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
ii)	Whether reportable?	Yes/No