



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

147

**CRM-M-29186-2026
Decided on : 21.05.2026**

Ajit Singh Bagga

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and another

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Mukesh Pandit, Advocate (through V.C.)
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. P.K. Jhanda, Sr. DAG, 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 28.10.2024 (Annexure P-3), passed by learned JMIC, Gurugram, in case bearing CIS No: CHI/4966/2021, dated 28.10.2024, titled as, “*State of Haryana through APP v. Ajit Singh Bagga Etc.*”, filed u/s 25 of the Payments and Settlement Systems Act, 2007, Police Station Shivaji Nagar, Gurugram.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner had availed a business loan and had repaid an amount of about Rs.70,00,000/- by way of equated monthly installments till the year 2017. However, due to heavy business losses, he could not maintain regularity in payment of the outstanding EMIs and consequently, his loan account was classified as ‘NPA’.

It is further submitted that respondent No.2 initiated various complaints under Section 25 of the Payments and Settlement Systems Act,

2007 in the years 2016 and 2018. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner subsequently came to know that respondent No.2 had instituted several other complaints under Section 25 of the Payments and Settlement Systems Act, 2007 as well as under the NI Act, however, he was never served in those complaints at his actual address, particularly when he was already contesting another criminal trial.

3. Learned counsel further contends that in due course of time, the petitioner came to be declared as 'Proclaimed Offender/Proclaimed Person' in several other cases as well. However, upon grant of opportunity by this Court in those matters, the petitioner had already put in appearance before the concerned trial Courts and was thereafter released on bail.

In support of his contention, learned counsel refers to Annexure P-7 appended with the petition, i.e., order dated 06.09.2022, passed by the Coordinate Bench of this Court in CRM-M-9900-2022, titled as, "*Ajit Singh Bagga v. State of Haryana and another*", wherein, in another criminal complaint, while disposing of the said petition, petitioner was directed to surrender before the concerned Court within the stipulated time period.

To cut short the controversy, learned counsel submits that petitioner is willing to join the process of law, in case one opportunity is granted to him, subject to any condition(s) that may be imposed by this Court.

4. 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.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel, who puts appearance on advance notice, 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.

6. 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).

7. 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-3) 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.

8. 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 28.10.2024 (P-3) 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/Illaq Magistrate/Duty Magistrate on or before **08.06.2026**.

It is also made clear here that in view of above impugned order (P-3), if a result FIR under Section 174-A of IPC (209 of BNS, 2023) stood

registered, in that situation, present order would be of no avail, as the said FIR is not under challenge before this Court.

9. 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.5,000/- 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.

10. **With aforementioned terms, present petition stands disposed of.**
Pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand(s) disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

May 21, 2026
J.Ram

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