



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

(142)

CRM-M-58859-2025(O&M)
DATE OF DECISION: 20.01.2026

Shikha Sharma

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present Mr.Varun Issar, Advocate,
and Mr. Shubham Pathania, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr.Anup Singh, AAG, Punjab.
Mr. Abnash Singh, Advocate, for complainant.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023 for quashing of order dated 17.05.2025 (Annexure P-1) in CRM-1325-2024, titled State versus Deepak Sharma, vide which petitioner has been declared proclaimed person in case FIR No.237 dated 08.07.2023, under Sections 420, 406, 506 and 120-B IPC and Section 13 of Punjab Travel Professions (Regulation) Act, registered at Police Station, City Faridkot, and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the provisions of Section 82(1A) has not been complied with as per the statement of the Executing Constable as he stated that one copy of proclamation was affixed at his house and another at the notice board of the Court complex and prayed that order dated 17.05.2025 (Annexure P-1) be quashed on this ground.

3. In pursuance of advance notice, Mr.Anup Singh, AAG, Punjab appeared on behalf of respondent/State and Mr. Abnash Singh, Advocate,



appeared on behalf of complainant and apprised the Court that present petitioner is a habitual offender and the different Courts have passed orders regarding her act and conduct by passing a detailed order and placed on record copy of order dated 20.11.2025 passed by this Court in CRM-M-58299-2025, copy of order dated 11.11.2025 passed by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in CRM-M-57375-2025 and copy of order dated 19.12.2025, passed by learned JMIC, Faridkot, and prayed that her petition be dismissed.

4. On the other hand, State counsel also opposed the prayer by submitting that the petitioner is habitual offender and declared proclaimed offender in six cases and her anticipatory bail petition was dismissed by this Court and she along with her husband is actively involved in fraud cases in the area of Faridkot and collected crores of rupees.

5. Heard.

6. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and the contentions raised by the learned counsel for the petitioner as well as of complainant and of learned State counsel and perusal of the orders placed on record by the complainant, this Court does not find any merit in the present petition and the same is hereby dismissed.

20.01.2026
mamta

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No