

CRM-M-63791-2025

2026:PHHC:001922

150 (2nd case)**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH****CRM-M-63791-2025**

Rajinder Singh @ Jinder

....Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

Date of decision: January 12, 2026**Date of Uploading: January 12, 2026****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL****Present:-** Mr. Rakesh Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Baljinder Singh Sra, Additional AG Punjab.

***********SUMEET GOEL, J. (ORAL)**

Present petition has been filed under Section 528 of the BNSS, 2023, seeking quashing/ setting aside of the impugned order dated 12.11.2009 (Annexure P-4) passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Ludhiana, whereby, the petitioner was declared as proclaimed person, in a criminal case No.24/1 of 25.07.2003 titled as "State Vs. Bharpur Singh".

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has iterated that the impugned order, whereby the petitioner has been declared a proclaimed person, is wholly illegal, arbitrary, and unsustainable in the eyes of law. Learned counsel has further iterated that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. Learned counsel has argued that the petitioner

CRM-M-63791-2025

was admitted to bail by the trial Court, vide order dated 25.07.2003 (Annexure P-2) and had been appearing regularly before the trial Court. Learned counsel has iterated that vide order dated 22.11.2007, the bail of the petitioner was cancelled and thereafter, vide order dated 12.11.2009, the petitioner was declared as proclaimed person. Learned counsel has argued that the petitioner was unemployed and upon getting an opportunity, he immigrated to Greece and settled there. Learned counsel has argued that the petitioner was not aware about the proceedings pending against him. Learned counsel has further argued that vide judgment dated 04.09.2010 (Annexure P-5), co-accused of the petitioner, namely, Bharpur Singh and Ajit Singh were acquitted by the trial Court of the charge(s) framed against them as the prosecution had failed to prove its case. Learned counsel has further iterated that the serving constable, who was required to make the publication of the proclamation, did not follow the procedure envisaged under Section 82 of the Cr. P.C., in its true essence, as he had not read the publication in some conspicuous place. Learned counsel has urged that non-appearance of the petitioner was neither willful nor intentional and he came to know about this fact only from his other co-accused. Learned counsel has further argued that the petitioner did not try to evade the proceedings pending against him. Learned counsel asserts that the impugned order is *ex facie* illegal, arbitrary and unsustainable in the eyes of law and is, therefore, liable to be set-aside. Learned counsel asserts that the impugned order has been passed without properly scrutinizing or verifying the authenticity of the report submitted by the serving official. Consequently, the order declaring

CRM-M-63791-2025

the petitioner as a proclaimed person (wrongly written as proclaimed offender in the impugned order) is unsustainable in the eyes of law and deserves to be quashed.

3. Learned State counsel has filed reply by way of an affidavit dated 12.12.2025, which is already on record. Raising submissions in tandem with the said reply, learned State counsel opposed the present petition. While refuting the case set up by the petitioner, detailed arguments were advanced on merits, contending that the petitioner was aware about the proceedings pending against him, but he intentionally absented himself and went to Greece without seeking prior permission from the trial Court. Consequently, the petitioner has been rightly declared as proclaimed person, vide impugned order. It has further been pointed out that the learned Court below scrupulously adhered to the procedure prescribed under Section 82 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, and no infirmity or irregularity is discernible from the record. Learned State counsel has, therefore, contended that the conduct of the petitioner clearly establishes his deliberate defiance of the judicial process and misuse of the concession of bail. Accordingly, dismissal of the instant petition has been prayed for.

4. I have heard the learned counsel for the rival parties and carefully perused the record of the case.

5. The law is well settled that no person can be declared a proclaimed offender/person unless the procedure prescribed under Section 82 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 is meticulously adhered to. It is trite law that the provisions of Section 82 are mandatory in nature, and any

non-compliance thereof vitiates the entire proceedings. In the present case, the petitioner was admitted to bail by the trial Court. It is asserted that as the petitioner was unemployed, therefore, upon getting an opportunity, he went to Greece and settled there, which is stated to be not done deliberately by him. It is further asserted that co-accused of the petitioner have already been acquitted by the trial Court *qua* the charge(s) framed against them. It is argued that the petitioner came to know about pendency of proceedings against him only through his co-accused, and upon gaining such knowledge, he approached this Court vide instant petition seeking quashing/ setting aside of the impugned order declaring him a proclaimed person.

A perusal of the *zimni* orders brought forth by the petitioner, vide CRM-46622-2025, shows that the serving official, who made the publication in question, had not read the proclamation on some conspicuous place as per the requirement of provision under Section 82 of the Cr. P.C. It has been asserted that no such satisfaction, as required under Section 82 of the Cr. P.C., regarding due execution of proclamation against the petitioner has been recorded in the impugned order. However, the trial Court vide impugned order dated 12.11.2009 declared the petitioner as proclaimed person which is not shown to have been executed in conformity with Section 82 of the Cr. P.C.

6. This Court finds the course adopted by the Court below is antithesis to the provisions of Section 82 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973. The Court below has committed illegality by issuing the said proclamation under Section 82 of the Criminal Procedure Code, 1973

without compliance of mandatory requirements of law. The learned Court below, while declaring the petitioner as proclaimed person, failed to satisfy itself regarding due execution of proclamation and proceeded in a mechanical manner. Such an order being violative of mandatory provisions of law, cannot be sustained. Section 82 of the Criminal Procedure Code, 1973 reads as under:

“82. Proclamation for person absconding. - (1) If any Court has reason to believe (whether after taking evidence or not) that any person against whom a warrant has been issued by it has absconded or is concealing himself so that such warrant cannot be executed, such Court may publish a written proclamation requiring him to appear at a specified place and at a specified time not less than thirty days from the date of publishing such proclamation.

(2) The proclamation shall be published as follows: -

(i)(a) it shall be publicly read in some conspicuous place of the town or village in which such person ordinarily resides;

(b) it shall be affixed to some conspicuous part of the house or homestead in which such person ordinarily resides or to some conspicuous place of such town or village;

(c) a copy thereof shall be affixed to some conspicuous part of the court-house;

(ii) the Court may also, if it thinks fit, direct a copy of the proclamation to be published in a daily newspaper circulating in the place in which such person ordinarily resides.

(3) A statement in writing by the Court issuing the proclamation to the effect that the proclamation was duly published on a specified day, in the manner specified in clause (i) of sub-section (2), shall be conclusive evidence that the requirements of this Section have been complied with, and that the proclamation was published on such day.

[(4) Where a proclamation published under sub-section (1) is in respect of a person accused of an offence punishable under Sections 302, 304, 364, 367, 382, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 402, 436, 449, 459, or 460 of the Indian Penal Code (45 of 1860), and such person fails to appear at the specified place and time required by the proclamation, the Court may, after making such inquiry as it thinks fit, pronounce him a proclaimed offender and make a declaration to that effect.

(5) The provisions of sub-sections (2) and (3) shall apply to a declaration made by the Court under sub-section (4) as they apply to the proclamation published under sub-section (1).”

7. A Coordinate Bench of this Court while dealing with invocation of the provision of Section 82 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, against an accused in the case of ‘*Sonu v. State of Haryana, 2021(1) RCR (Criminal) 319*’, held as under:

“9. The essential requirements of section 82 of the Cr.P.C., 1973 for issuance and publication of proclamation against an absconder and declaring him as proclaimed person/offender may be summarized as under:-

(i) Prior issuance of warrant of arrest by the Court is sine qua non for issuance and publication of the proclamation and the Court has to first issue warrant of arrest against the person concerned. (See Rohit Kumar v. State of Delhi: 2008 CrI. J. 2561).

(ii) There must be a report before the Court that the person against whom warrant was issued had absconded or had been concealing himself so that the warrant of arrest could not be executed against him. However, the Court is not bound to take evidence in this regard before issuing a Proclamation under section 82(1) of the Cr.P.C., 1973. (See Rohit Kumar v. State of Delhi : 2008 CrI. J. 2561).

(iii) The Court cannot issue the Proclamation as a matter of course because the Police is asking for it. The Court must be prima facie satisfied that the person has absconded or is concealing himself so that the warrant of arrest, previously issued, cannot be executed, despite reasonable diligence. (See Bishundayal Mahton and others v. Emperor : AIR 1943 Patna 366 and Devender Singh Negi v. State of U.P. : 1994 CrI LJ (Allahabad HC) 1783).

(iv) The requisite date and place for appearance must be specified in the proclamation requiring such person to appear on such date at the specified place. Such date must not be less than 30 clear days from the date of issuance and publication of the proclamation. (See Gurappa Gugal and others v. State of Mysore : 1969 CriLJ 826 and Shokat Ali v. State of Haryana : 2020(2) RCR (CRIMINAL) 339).

(v) Where the period between issuance and publication of the proclamation and the specified date of hearing is less than thirty days, the accused cannot be declared a proclaimed person/offender and the proclamation has to be issued and published again. (See Dilbagh Singh v. State of Punjab (P&H) : 2015 (8) RCR (CRIMINAL) 166 and Ashok Kumar v. State of Haryana and another : 2013 (4) RCR (CRIMINAL) 550)

(vi) The Proclamation has to be published in the manner laid down in section 82(2) of the Cr.P.C., 1973. For publication the proclamation has to be first publicly read in some conspicuous place of the town or village in which the accused ordinarily resides; then the same has to be affixed to some conspicuous part of the house or homestead in which the accused ordinarily resides or to some conspicuous place of such town or village and thereafter a copy of the proclamation has to be affixed to some conspicuous part of the Court-house. The three sub-clauses (a)- (c) in section 82 (2)(i) of the Cr.P.C., 1973 are conjunctive and not disjunctive, which means that there would be no valid publication of the proclamation unless all the three modes of publication are proved. (See Pawan Kumar Gupta v. The State of W.B. : 1973 CriLJ 1368). Where the Court so orders a copy of the proclamation has to be additionally published in a daily newspaper circulating in the place in which the accused ordinarily resides. Advisably, proclamation has to be issued with four copies so that one each of the three copies of the proclamation may be affixed to some conspicuous part of the house or homestead in which the accused ordinarily resides, to some conspicuous place of such town or village and to some conspicuous part of the Courthouse and report regarding publication may be made on the fourth copy of the proclamation. Additional copy will be required where the proclamation is also required to be published in the newspaper.

(vii) Statement of the serving officer has to be recorded by the Court as to the date and mode of publication of the proclamation. (See Birad Dan v. State: 1958 CriLJ 965).

(viii) The Court issuing the proclamation has to make a statement in writing in its order that the proclamation was duly published on a specified day in a manner specified in section 82(2)(i) of the Cr.P.C., 1973. Such statement in writing by the Court is declared to be conclusive evidence that the requirements of Section 82 have been complied with and that the proclamation was published on such day. (See Birad Dan v. State: 1958 CriLJ 965).

(xi) The conditions specified in section 82(2) of the Cr.P.C., 1973 for the publication of a Proclamation against an absconder are mandatory. Any non-compliance therewith cannot be cured as an 'irregularity' and renders the Proclamation and proceedings subsequent thereto a nullity. (See Devendra Singh Negi alias Debu v. State of U.P. and another: 1994 CriLJ 1783 and Pal Singh v. The State: 1955 CriLJ 318)."

8. It is pertinent to mention that it is by now a settled principle of law that before issuing a proclamation under Section 82 Cr. P.C., the Court must record its satisfaction that the accused, against whom the proclamation is sought to be issued, is absconding or concealing himself with an intent to evade arrest. This foundational requirement is conspicuously absent in the present case. A perusal of the impugned order dated 12.11.2009 reveals that no such satisfaction was recorded by the Court below, nor was there any material to justify the inference that the petitioner had absconded or was deliberately avoiding his appearance.

9. The provisions of Section 82 of the Code of Criminal Procedure having serious ramifications *qua* the right of the accused concerning his presence in the criminal trial proceedings ought not be and cannot be invoked in casual and cavalier manner. The requirement of recording of satisfaction, that the accused has absconded or is concealing himself so that warrant of his arrest cannot be executed, as embodied in Section 82 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, is to be scrupulously complied with based on relevant material available on record of the case in that regard. Non-

CRM-M-63791-2025

adherence to said requirement while declaring the accused as proclaimed person vitiates the proclamation proceedings initiated against the accused.

10. Hence, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the criminal proceedings pending against the petitioner. It is, therefore, an appropriate case for the exercise of powers under Section 528 of BNSS/Section 482 of Cr. P.C. and to bring to an end the criminal proceedings initiated in the light of the criminal case *ibid* against the petitioner.

11. In view of the above findings, in the entirety of facts and circumstances of the present case, the present petition is allowed; and the impugned order dated 12.11.2009 (Annexure P-4) passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Ludhiana, whereby, the petitioner was declared as proclaimed person, in a criminal case No.24/1 of 25.07.2003 titled as “State Vs. Bharpur Singh” as well as the other consequential proceedings arising therefrom, are quashed.

12. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of accordingly.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

January 12, 2026
mahavir

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No