



**201 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
CHANDIGARH**

**CRM-M-20044-2020 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 30.04.2026**

GURDEEP SINGH

...Petitioner

V/S

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL

Present: Mr. Sunil Kumar, Advocate
for Mr. Ashish K. Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Kshitij Bharti, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana.

Mr. Davinder Lubana, Advocate
for the complainant.

SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL J. (Oral)

Petitioner seeks quashing of order dated 10.04.2015 of learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Panchkula, vide which he was declared a proclaimed person in case titled *State Vs. Bharat Singh and Others* arising out of FIR No. 87 dated 01.07.2014 under Sections 323, 406, 420, 294, 354, 498-A, 506 and 120-B Indian Penal Code, Police Station Raipur Rani, District Panchkula and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner's father, mother and wife faced trial in the criminal case arising out of aforementioned FIR. They were all acquitted vide judgment dated 15.11.2019 (Annexure P-6). Appeal filed by the complainant against the judgment of acquittal was also dismissed on 16.10.2025. He further submits that proclamation proceedings were initiated during the trial, behind the back of petitioner, who was, at the relevant time, residing at Singapore. Vide order dated 25.08.2020, after issuing notice of motion,

this Court stayed the operation and effect of order dated 10.04.2015, vide which the petitioner was declared a proclaimed person. Thereafter, petitioner moved an application for anticipatory bail before learned Additional Sessions Judge, Panchkula. The application for anticipatory bail was allowed, pursuant to which petitioner had joined investigation.

Learned State counsel submits that petitioner was declared proclaimed person on 10.04.2015 and evaded arrest for as long as 05 years.

Learned counsel for respondent No. 2 vehemently submits that interim order dated 25.08.2020 was obtained by the petitioner by misrepresenting facts, on the basis of cancelled passport. The petitioner was well aware of pendency of the FIR as his near relatives were facing the trial. Some photographs were placed on record to show that petitioner had been visiting India regularly.

Since petitioner has been released on anticipatory bail by order of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Panchkula, the petition becomes infructuous and is hereby disposed of accordingly.

Pending CRM(s), if any, are also disposed of accordingly.

30.04.2026
Ajay Goswami

(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)
JUDGE

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