



**174 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-16267-2026

Date of decision: 25.03.2026

MOHINDER SINGH

...PETITIONER

V/S

STATE OF PUNJAB

...RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present: Mr. Akun Sheemar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (ORAL)

1. This petition has been filed under Section 528 Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023 for quashing of order dated 22.04.2022 (Annexure P-14) passed by learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, SBS Nagar, vide which, the petitioner has been declared as proclaimed person in FIR No.22 dated 02.04.2016 registered under Sections 279, 337 and 338 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Mukandpur, District SBS Nagar.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is a British citizen of Indian origin; he was granted permission to travel abroad in the present case, after which, he duly returned and appeared before the trial Court; due to the outbreak of Covid-19 pandemic, the case was repeatedly adjourned, and thereafter on 01.02.2021, notice was issued to petitioner for 06.04.2021 (Annexure P-6); however, the same were received back unserved and vide order dated 06.04.2021 (Annexure P-7), bailable warrants were issued against petitioner. Thereafter, vide order dated 13.08.2021 (Annexure P-9), bail of the petitioner was cancelled and his bail/surety bonds were forfeited, and the warrants were received back unexecuted; thereafter,



proclamation proceedings were initiated against the petitioner vide order dated 23.12.2021 (Annexure P-12) and finally on 22.04.2022, the petitioner was declared proclaimed person vide impugned order dated 22.04.2022 (Annexure P-14). As such, learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the impugned order has been passed in a mechanical manner and prayed that it be quashed.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Ms. Alisha Soni, AAG, Punjab, who is present in the Court, accepted notice on behalf of respondent-State and submitted that the petitioner is a habitual offender; in the year 2016 also, the petitioner was declared proclaimed person and was arrested and subsequently, he was released on bail. Thereafter again, the petitioner misused the concession of bail and did not put in appearance before the trial Court intentionally, due to which, he was again declared proclaimed offender on 22.04.2022. Learned State counsel further submitted that for the last four years, the petitioner did not turn up and if such persons are granted relief, it will make a mockery of process of law.

5. Heard.

6. This Court has considered the contentions of learned counsel for the parties and perused the order of learned trial Court dated 22.04.2022 and found that the learned trial Court has not committed any error or irregularity while passing the impugned order; the petitioner is a habitual offender and was declared proclaimed person earlier also in the year 2016; the petitioner was aware about the case pending against him and did not put in appearance before the trial Court intentionally, due to which, he was again declared proclaimed offender on 22.04.2022. Now, after a period of 04 years, the petitioner has approached this Court for quashing of impugned order, hence, this Court finds



merit in the contentions of learned State counsel and the petitioner does not deserve any relief.

7. In view of the above, this Court finds no merit in the present petition and the same stands dismissed.

March 25, 2026
manisha

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

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