



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

128

CRM-M-20209-2026
Decided on : 16.04.2026

Jasmsaid Ali

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Salman Ahmed, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Parveen Kumar Aggarwal, Addl. AG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Instant petition, under Section 528 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 482 Cr.P.C.), has been filed for seeking quashing of order dated 13.03.2026 (Annexure P-6) passed by learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Nuh, in case bearing No. NACT/117/2021, dated 04.08.2021, titled as, "*Heera Lal v. Jamshed*", filed u/s 138 of Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 (in short, 'NI Act') along with all consequential proceedings, vide which, petitioner has been declared as 'Proclaimed Person' without adopting due procedure of law.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that complainant/respondent No.2, instituted a criminal complaint bearing No. NACT/117/2021, under Section 138 of the NI Act, on the allegation that petitioner, in discharge of his liability, issued a cheque dated 08.06.2021 for an amount of ₹2,00,000/- in favour of the complainant/respondent No. 2. However, upon presentation, the said cheque was dishonoured by the bank with the remarks "**Funds Insufficient**". Consequently, a legal notice was

served upon the petitioner, and thereafter, the aforesaid complaint was filed, pursuant to which the petitioner was summoned vide order dated 22.12.2021 (Annexure P-2).

It is further submitted that the petitioner was granted bail by the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Nuh, vide order dated 07.06.2023 (copy of order produced by learned counsel is taken on record), and thereafter, he regularly appeared before the trial Court. On 04.12.2025, petitioner moved an application seeking exemption from personal appearance, which was duly allowed, and the matter was adjourned to 11.12.2025. However, due to unavoidable circumstances, petitioner could not appear before the trial Court on the said date. Consequently, the trial Court cancelled his bail, forfeited his bonds to the State, and issued non-bailable warrants for 03.01.2026. Thereafter, in due course of time, vide the impugned order dated 13.03.2026 (P-6), the petitioner was declared a proclaimed person.

It is, thus, contended that the petitioner's absence was neither intentional nor deliberate, but occurred due to the reasons stated here-above. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner is willing to join the proceedings and undertakes to appear before the trial Court, if granted an opportunity, subject to any conditions that may be imposed by this Hon'ble Court.

3. On noticing the contention of petitioner's counsel, this Court is also not required to examine the sustainability of the order vide which, petitioner was declared 'proclaimed person', however, inclination has been expressed by the petitioner himself that in case one opportunity is granted for releasing the petitioner on bail, by protecting him from arrest, he shall not absent himself in future without prior permission from the Court, and shall fully cooperate for early disposal of the trial.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel opposes the request of the petitioner by submitting that petitioner does not deserve any sympathy, because, he knowingly evade the proceedings before the trial Court. Learned State counsel further submits that looking at his behaviour, there is no surety that in future, petitioner would not be absent for the purpose of delaying the trial.

5. In number of cases, wherein, accused stopped appearing in criminal cases, the Courts are compelled to declare accused as 'Proclaimed Person/Proclaimed Offender'. After examining the facts, this Court has formulated a uniform method to ensure the presence of accused before the concerned Court, to enable it to proceed further instead of delaying the proceedings by awaiting the presence of accused.

Intentional or unintentional default of the accused can be dealt with by examining the facts from case to case involved, and where it is realised that absence or prolonged absence of such accused is intentional to evade the process of law, he/she can be penalized examining the nature of crime in which he is facing the proceedings and thereupon by imposing some cost amount subject to his/her capacity to pay.

Primary object of every Court is only to examine the commission of crime in question before it *viz-a-viz* the person/accused, who is subjected to such proceedings, and if possible justice be imparted at the earliest without unnecessary delay. It is not expected that undue time would be devoted in securing the presence of absconded accused and also to waste energy by enforcing the special mechanism to arrest such accused.

Considering all such aspects, this Court in the case of ***Ashish Kumar Honda @ Ashish Handa Vs. State of Punjab, 2022 (4) RCR (criminal) 765; Law Finder Doc Id # 20238111*** considered similar plea of

appearance, expressed at the instance of the accused, who failed to appear before the Court at appropriate time, and observed that:

“paramount consideration of the Court is to secure presence of accused on each and every date for speeding up the trial for its final conclusion. Already Courts are flooded with so much litigation, resulting in slow pace of work, because of more than one reason. The required energy and manpower be used for expediting the proceedings of the Court, instead of running after the accused persons to get hold of them.”

Again, this Court has considered the aforementioned similar plea in case **Veena @ Veena Devi v. State of Punjab (CRM-M-2206-2025, decided on 16.01.2025.**

6. I have considered the submissions of both the sides and examined the relevant material available on record. The petitioner has remiss in appearing before the Court due the reasons mentioned here-above, and consequently, impugned order (P-6) declaring the petitioner as ‘proclaimed person’ has been passed against him. It also cannot be left unnoticed that as and when the petitioner came to know about passing of the impugned order, the petitioner has immediately moved the present petition, showing his inclination to submit himself before the trial Court.

7. In totality of circumstances, I am of the view that the petitioner can be given one chance to appear before the trial Court, so that proceedings may restart and continue in smooth manner. Accordingly, plea of the petitioner is accepted. Impugned order dated 13.03.2026 (P-6) is **set aside** to the extent of declaring the petitioner as ‘proclaimed person’, and he is directed to be released on bail, in the eventuality of surrender by him before the trial Court on or before **30.04.2026**.

The petitioner shall also furnish fresh bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court. Besides, petitioner would also submit specific undertaking/affidavit that he will keep appearing during the

proceedings of the trial in future and the proceedings would not be delayed because of his conduct.

However, this order shall be subject to the payment of Rs.10,000/- as costs, to be deposited by the petitioner in an Old Age Home of the area, as may be decided by the learned Trial Court. The Trial Court shall also specify the time frame within which such costs will be required to be deposited, but not more than two weeks, failing which this order would not be of any advantage to the petitioner.

8. **With aforementioned terms, present petition stands disposed of.**

Pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand(s) disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

April 16, 2026

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*
Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*