

CRM-M-8943-2026

2026:PHHC:050172



154

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-8943-2026

Amanpreet Singh

....Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

Date of Decision: April 01, 2026

Date of Uploading: April 01, 2026

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present:- Mr. Tajeshwar S. Sullar, Advocate for the petitioner (Through V.C.).

Mr. Adhiraj Singh Thind, AAG Punjab.

SUMEET GOEL, J.

Present petition has been filed under Section 528 of the BNSS, 2023 seeking setting aside of the impugned order dated 06.12.2025 (Annexure P-3) passed by the learned Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Nabha, whereby, the petitioner has been declared as proclaimed person, in complaint case bearing No.CHI/120/2022 titled as "State of Punjab versus Amanpreet Singh", in FIR No.10 dated 17.01.2022, registered under Sections 406, 420 of IPC, at Police Station Nabha, District Patiala.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the impugned order, whereby the petitioner has been declared proclaimed person, is wholly illegal, arbitrary, and unsustainable in the eyes of law. Learned counsel has argued that non-appearance of the petitioner was an inadvertent mistake, as he could not get to know the date of hearing from his counsel before the Court below, despite

CRM-M-8943-2026

making time and again efforts. Learned counsel has submitted that, vide order dated 24.09.2025, the application seeking exemption from personal appearance of the petitioner as well as bail was declined, and the bail bonds were forfeited to the State, with non-bailable warrants having been issued against the petitioner for 14.10.2025. Learned counsel has submitted that it was mentioned in the order dated 14.10.2025 that non-bailable warrants were received back unexecuted, and therefore, proclamation under Section 82 of the Cr. P.C. was issued against the petitioner for 14.11.2025. Learned counsel has further submitted that on 14.11.2025, the case was adjourned to 06.12.2025 awaiting appearance of the petitioner. Learned counsel has further argued that, ultimately, vide impugned order dated 06.12.2025, the petitioner was declared as a proclaimed person.

2.1. Learned counsel has further argued that proclamation issued against the petitioner was in gross violation of provisions of Section 82 of the Cr. P.C./ Section 84 of the BNSS. A perusal of the statement dated 07.11.2025 of the serving official reveals that the proclamation was not read in some conspicuous place. Learned counsel has argued that, still the petitioner was declared as proclaimed person, vide impugned order by the Court below.

2.2. Learned counsel has argued that, thus, the order, declaring the petitioner proclaimed person, is in gross violation of law and principles of natural justice as there was no deliberate evasion or non-appearance on the part of the petitioner. On the basis of these submissions, learned counsel has prayed that the impugned order is liable to be set-aside being illegal and unjustified.

3. Learned State counsel has filed reply by way of an affidavit dated 31.03.2026, in the Court today, which is taken on record. Raising submissions in tandem with the said reply, learned State counsel has opposed the present petition. While refuting the case set up by the petitioner, detailed arguments were advanced

on merits, contending that the offence alleged against the petitioner is serious in nature. Furthermore, it has been submitted by the learned State counsel that vide order dated 21.02.2022, the anticipatory bail application of the petitioner was allowed by the Court below, and therefore, the petitioner caused appearance before the Court on 11.07.2022 and furnished personal bonds, however, he failed to furnish surety bonds, and thereafter, continuously absented himself from the court proceedings. It has been further submitted that consequently, bailable warrants following by non-bailable warrants were issued against the petitioner, but he had chosen not to cause appearance before the trial Court. Learned State counsel has further argued that ultimately, learned Court below issued proclamation against the petitioner, and finally, vide impugned order dated 06.12.2025, declared the petitioner as a proclaimed person after following the procedure as laid-down under Section 82 of the Cr. P.C., 1973/ Section 84 of the BNSS, in letter and spirit and no discrepancy whatsoever is forthcoming from the records of the case. Accordingly, dismissal of the instant petition has been prayed for.

3.1. Learned State counsel has, however, submitted that pursuant to the order dated 07.03.2026 passed by this Court, the petitioner caused appearance before the trial Court and furnished requisite bail/ surety bonds.

4. I have heard the learned counsel for the rival parties and carefully perused the record of the case.

5. The law is well settled that no person can be declared a proclaimed offender/person unless the procedure prescribed under Section 82 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973/ Section 84 of the BNSS, is strictly and meticulously adhered to. It is trite that the provisions of Section 82 Cr.P.C. are mandatory in nature, and any non-compliance thereof vitiates the entire proceedings. Furthermore, Section 82(1) of the Cr.P.C. clearly provides that before issuing a

proclamation requiring a person to appear, the Court must have reason to believe, based on material on record, that such person has absconded or is concealing himself, so that the warrant cannot be executed.

5.1. Upon perusal of the record as well as reply filed by the State and the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner, it is borne out that non-bailable warrants issued against the petitioner remained unexecuted. It has been pleaded by the petitioner that non-appearance of the petitioner was not deliberate or intentional. It is further borne out that, after issuance of proclamation against the petitioner, statement of the serving official was recorded. Perusal of the said statement reveals that, at the time of effecting of proclamation, the house of the petitioner was found locked, and further, the proclamation was not read publicly at a conspicuous place of the town or village in which the petitioner ordinarily resides, nor is there any material to demonstrate compliance with the prescribed modes of publication, in terms of the provisions of Section 82 Cr.P.C.

6. This Court finds that the course adopted by the Court below is in clear contravention of, and antithetical to, the provisions of Section 82 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973. The Court below has committed a manifest illegality by issuing and acting upon the proclamation without ensuring compliance with the mandatory statutory requirements. The learned Court below, while declaring the petitioner as proclaimed person, failed to record the requisite judicial satisfaction regarding due execution of the proclamation and proceeded in a mechanical and perfunctory manner, rendering the impugned order legally unsustainable. Such an order being violative of mandatory provisions of law, cannot be sustained. Section 82 of the Criminal Procedure Code, 1973 reads as under:

“82. Proclamation for person absconding. - (1) If any Court has reason to believe (whether after taking evidence or not) that any person against whom a warrant has been issued by it has absconded or is concealing himself so that such warrant cannot be executed, such Court may publish a

written proclamation requiring him to appear at a specified place and at a specified time not less than thirty days from the date of publishing such proclamation.

(2) The proclamation shall be published as follows: -

(i)(a) it shall be publicly read in some conspicuous place of the town or village in which such person ordinarily resides;

(b) it shall be affixed to some conspicuous part of the house or homestead in which such person ordinarily resides or to some conspicuous place of such town or village;

(c) a copy thereof shall be affixed to some conspicuous part of the court-house;

(ii) the Court may also, if it thinks fit, direct a copy of the proclamation to be published in a daily newspaper circulating in the place in which such person ordinarily resides.

(3) A statement in writing by the Court issuing the proclamation to the effect that the proclamation was duly published on a specified day, in the manner specified in clause (i) of sub-section (2), shall be conclusive evidence that the requirements of this Section have been complied with, and that the proclamation was published on such day.

[(4) Where a proclamation published under sub-section (1) is in respect of a person accused of an offence punishable under Sections 302, 304, 364, 367, 382, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 402, 436, 449, 459, or 460 of the Indian Penal Code (45 of 1860), and such person fails to appear at the specified place and time required by the proclamation, the Court may, after making such inquiry as it thinks fit, pronounce him a proclaimed offender and make a declaration to that effect.

(5) The provisions of sub-sections (2) and (3) shall apply to a declaration made by the Court under sub-section (4) as they apply to the proclamation published under sub-section (1).]”

7. A Coordinate Bench of this Court while dealing with invocation of the provision of Section 82 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, against an accused in the case of ‘**Sonu v. State of Haryana, 2021(1) RCR (Criminal) 319**’, held as under:

“9. The essential requirements of section 82 of the Cr.P.C., 1973 for issuance and publication of proclamation against an absconder and declaring him as proclaimed person/offender may be summarized as under:-

(i) Prior issuance of warrant of arrest by the Court is sine qua non for issuance and publication of the proclamation and the Court has to first issue warrant of arrest against the person concerned. (See Rohit Kumar v. State of Delhi: 2008 CrI. J. 2561).

(ii) There must be a report before the Court that the person against whom warrant was issued had absconded or had been concealing himself so that the warrant of arrest could not be executed against him. However, the Court is not bound to take evidence in this regard before issuing a Proclamation under section 82(1) of the Cr.P.C., 1973. (See Rohit Kumar v. State of Delhi : 2008 CrI. J. 2561).

(iii) The Court cannot issue the Proclamation as a matter of course because the Police is asking for it. The Court must be prima facie satisfied that the person has absconded or is concealing himself so that the warrant

of arrest, previously issued, cannot be executed, despite reasonable diligence. (See Bishundayal Mahton and others v. Emperor : AIR 1943 Patna 366 and Devender Singh Negi v. State of U.P. : 1994 Cri LJ (Allahabad HC) 1783).

(iv) The requisite date and place for appearance must be specified in the proclamation requiring such person to appear on such date at the specified place. Such date must not be less than 30 clear days from the date of issuance and publication of the proclamation. (See Gurappa Gugal and others v. State of Mysore : 1969 CriLJ 826 and Shokat Ali v. State of Haryana : 2020(2) RCR (CRIMINAL) 339).

(v) Where the period between issuance and publication of the proclamation and the specified date of hearing is less than thirty days, the accused cannot be declared a proclaimed person/offender and the proclamation has to be issued and published again. (See Dilbagh Singh v. State of Punjab (P&H) : 2015 (8) RCR (CRIMINAL) 166 and Ashok Kumar v. State of Haryana and another : 2013 (4) RCR (CRIMINAL) 550)

(vi) The Proclamation has to be published in the manner laid down in section 82(2) of the Cr.P.C., 1973. 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 (a)- (c) in section 82 (2)(i) of the Cr.P.C., 1973 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. (See Pawan Kumar Gupta v. The State of W.B. : 1973 CriLJ 1368). Where the Court so orders a copy of the proclamation has to be additionally published in a daily newspaper circulating in the place in which the accused ordinarily resides. Advisably, proclamation has to be issued with four copies so that one each of the three copies of the proclamation may be affixed to some conspicuous part of the house or homestead in which the accused ordinarily resides, to some conspicuous place of such town or village and to some conspicuous part of the Courthouse and report regarding publication may be made on the fourth copy of the proclamation. Additional copy will be required where the proclamation is also required to be published in the newspaper.

(vii) Statement of the serving officer has to be recorded by the Court as to the date and mode of publication of the proclamation. (See Birad Dan v. State: 1958 CriLJ 965).

(viii) The Court issuing the proclamation has to make a statement in writing in its order that the proclamation was duly published on a specified day in a manner specified in section 82(2)(i) of the Cr.P.C., 1973. Such statement in writing by the Court is declared to be conclusive evidence that the requirements of Section 82 have been complied with and that the proclamation was published on such day. (See Birad Dan v. State: 1958 CriLJ 965).

(xi) The conditions specified in section 82(2) of the Cr.P.C., 1973 for the publication of a Proclamation against an absconder are mandatory. Any non-compliance therewith cannot be cured as an 'irregularity' and renders the Proclamation and proceedings subsequent thereto a nullity. (See Devendra Singh Negi alias Debu v. State of U.P. and another: 1994 CriLJ 1783 and Pal Singh v. The State: 1955 CriLJ 318)."

8. It is by now a settled principle of law that prior to issuing a proclamation under Section 82 Cr. P.C., the Court is required to record its satisfaction that the accused, against whom such proclamation is sought, is absconding or is concealing himself with the intention to evade arrest. This foundational and jurisdictional requirement is conspicuously absent in the present case. A perusal of the impugned order dated 06.12.2025 reveals that no such satisfaction has been recorded by the Court below, nor does the record disclose any material which could justify an inference that the petitioner had absconded or were deliberately avoiding their appearance before the Court. Furthermore, the effecting of proclamation was not done as per provisions of Section 82 of the Cr. P.C., resulting in serious prejudice to the petitioner.

9. The provisions of Section 82 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, having serious civil and criminal ramifications *qua* the rights of an accused, particularly affecting his liberty and participation in trial proceedings, cannot be invoked in a casual or cavalier manner. The mandatory requirement of recording satisfaction that the accused has absconded or is concealing himself so that the warrant of arrest cannot be executed, as embodied under Section 82 Cr.P.C., must be scrupulously complied with on the basis of cogent and relevant material available on record. Any non-adherence to this statutory mandate while declaring an accused as a proclaimed offender/person vitiates the proclamation proceedings in their entirety.

10. In the aforesaid backdrop, this Court is of the considered opinion that no useful purpose would be served by permitting the criminal proceedings to continue against the petitioner, which are founded upon an illegal and procedurally flawed proclamation. It is, therefore, a fit and appropriate case for the exercise of

inherent powers under Section 528 of the BNSS / Section 482 of the Cr.P.C., so as to prevent abuse of the process of law and to secure the ends of justice.

11. In view of the above findings, and considering the entirety of the facts and circumstances of the present case, the present petition is allowed. Consequently, the impugned order dated 06.12.2025 (Annexure P-3) passed by the learned Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Nabha, whereby, the petitioner has been declared as proclaimed person, in complaint case bearing No.CHI/120/2022 titled as “State of Punjab versus Amanpreet Singh”, in FIR No.10 dated 17.01.2022, registered under Sections 406, 420 of IPC, at Police Station Nabha, District Patiala, as well as all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, are hereby **quashed**.

12. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of accordingly.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

April 01, 2026
mahavir

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