

2025:PHHC:005609



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

129

CRM-M-63837-2024 (O&M)
Date of decision: 16.01.2025

Balkaran Singh @ Karan Kalra**...Petitioner**

Versus

State of Punjab and another**...Respondents****CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA**

Present:- Mr. Ranjeet K. Jaswal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)**1. CRM-1259-2025**

Allowed as prayed for.

Documents are taken on record as Annexures P-9 to P-11.

2. CRM-M-63837-2024 (O&M)

The instant petition has been filed by the petitioner for quashing of order dated 31.01.2023 (Annexure P-5), passed by the Court of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Patiala in case titled as ***State vs. Mandeep Singh Manna and others***, arising out of FIR No. 403 dated 20.11.2021, registered under Sections 341, 324, 323, 506 and 34 of IPC at Police Station Kotwali, Patiala, whereby the petitioner had been declared a proclaimed person.

3. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner on the grounds and it has been argued by his counsel that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the aforementioned case. The petitioner had been granted

2025:PHHC:005609



concession of bail. However, he could not appear before the Court due to the fact that he had sustained major bone fracture in his right leg and during the period from the year 2022 to 2024, he had undergone 04 medical surgeries. It is further submitted that non-appearance of the petitioner was not intentional or deliberate. It is further submitted that vide judgment dated 04.05.2024, passed by the learned trial Court, co-accused Mandeep Singh @ Money and Ritik have been acquitted and there is every likelihood that the petitioner will also be acquitted of the charges framed against him. Even otherwise, he had been declared a proclaimed person without following the proper procedure prescribed under Section 82 of Cr.P.C. He is ready to appear before the learned trial Court and join the Court proceedings. Hence, it is urged that the impugned order is liable to be set aside.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner at considerable length and have also gone through the material placed on record.

5. On giving due deliberations to the contentions as raised by learned counsel for the parties and on an overall perusal of the orders passed by the learned trial Court from the date of initiating proceedings under Section 82 of Cr.P.C. as against the petitioner till the date of declaring him a proclaimed person, I am of the considered opinion that the impugned order dated 31.03.2023 suffers from material illegalities and is liable to be quashed with all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom.

6. After going through the material placed on record as well as the copies of zimni orders passed by the learned trial Court, it is revealed that on 27.07.2022, since the notice issued to the petitioner was received back unserved and he failed to appear before the Court despite the case having been

2025:PHHC:005609



called several times, the learned trial Court had issued non-bailable warrants against him for 20.09.2022 but the same were also received unexecuted. Resultantly, vide order dated 20.09.2022, the learned trial Court had ordered for issuance of proclamation against him for 17.12.2022. A bare perusal of this order shows that the learned trial Court before ordering for publication of proclamation has not recorded its proper satisfaction that the petitioner had absconded or was concealing himself so that the warrant of arrest, previously issued, cannot be executed, despite reasonable diligence, which was in violation of the provisions of Section 82(1) of Cr.P.C. Reliance in this regard can be placed upon *Rohit Kumar Vs. State of Delhi : 2008 CrL J. 2561*.

7. Further, when the case was taken up on 17.12.2022, the proclamation issued against the petitioner was received back executed. However, since the Presiding Officer was on leave, the case was adjourned to 31.01.2023. This procedure adopted by the Court was not in true spirit as mandated under Section 82 of Cr.P.C. Further, a perusal of the statement of the serving police official Constable Hardeep Singh reveals that the proclamation was not read over in some conspicuous place of the town or village in which the petitioner was supposed to be residing. As per Section 82 (2) of Cr.P.C. for publication, the proclamation has to be first publicly read in some conspicuous place of the town or village in which the accused ordinarily resides; then the same has to be affixed to some conspicuous part of the house or homestead in which the accused ordinarily resides or to some conspicuous place of such town or village and thereafter a copy of the proclamation has to be affixed to some conspicuous part of the Court-house. The three sub-clauses

2025:PHHC:005609



(a)-(c) in Section 82 (2)(i) of the Cr.P.C. are conjunctive and not disjunctive, which means that there would be no valid publication of the proclamation unless all the three modes of publication are proved. Reliance in this regard can be placed upon *Pawan Kumar Gupta Vs. The State of W.B. : 1973 CriLJ 1368*.

8. Accordingly, in view of the discussion as made above and also in view of the ratio of law as laid down in above cited authorities, the present petition is allowed and the impugned order dated 31.01.2023 (Annexure P-5), passed by the Court of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Patiala in case titled as *State vs. Mandeep Singh Manna and others*, arising out of FIR No. 403 dated 20.11.2021, registered under Sections 341, 324, 323, 506 and 34 of IPC at Police Station Kotwali, Patiala, whereby the petitioner had been declared a proclaimed person, is quashed with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom.

9. However, the petitioner is directed to surrender before the Court concerned within a period of four weeks, subject to order for grant of anticipatory bail, if any passed on his petition to be filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023. In the absence of any order for grant of anticipatory bail and on such surrender, the petitioner shall be liable to be remanded to judicial custody subject to any order for grant of regular bail to be passed by the concerned Court in accordance with law.

10. Needless to observe that in case any application is filed before the concerned Court for grant of regular bail, then the concerned Court shall be bound to dispose of the same expeditiously and that nothing in this order



shall be treated as expression of any opinion on merits so as to bind or influence the concerned Court in disposal of the same.

11. Till the appearance of the petitioner before the learned trial Court, his arrest shall remain stayed.

12. It is made clear that in case the petitioner fails to appear before the learned trial Court within a period of four weeks from today, this petition shall be deemed to be dismissed.

16.01.2025
Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>