



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

113

CRM-M-40203-2025
Date of decision: 28.07.2025

Umesh Veer Vikram Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. Parveen Kumar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ravi Kamal Gupta, Special Public Prosecutor
for respondent No.2-CBI.

Mr. P.S. Ahluwalia, Advocate and
Mr. Keerat Dhillon, Advocate
for the complainant.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.

1. The petitioner is seeking quashing of order dated 15.07.2025 (Annexure P-9) arising out of FIR No.RC-0512023S00012 (Annexure P-1) dated 15.11.2023 at PS SCB/Chandigarh under Sections 452, 323, 506, 120B, 148, 149 of the IPC and RC-0512023S00013 (Annexure P-2) dated 15.11.2023 under Sections 120B read with Sections 452, 323, 506, 427, 148 of the IPC at PS SCB/Chandigarh, whereby the petitioner has been declared a proclaimed offender, and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom.

2. The present petition is the fourth successive attempt by the petitioner to seek relief arising out of the same cause of action. At the



CRM-M-40203-2025

very outset, learned Special Public Prosecutor for the CBI, assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, has drawn the attention of this Court to the repetitive nature of the proceedings instituted by the petitioner before this Court and the Hon'ble Supreme Court, all of which have culminated in unsuccessful outcomes.

3. A perusal of the record discloses a clear and deliberate pattern of repetitive and vexatious litigation. It appears designed not to pursue legitimate relief but to obstruct the progress of the criminal proceedings pending before the Trial Court and to frustrate the due process of law.

4. The petitioner had earlier filed CRM-M-6803-2024 which was dismissed on merits. He thereafter approached this Court again through CRM-M-29516-2025, which was dismissed as withdrawn on 26.05.2025 after the Court declined to entertain the relief sought. Shortly thereafter, CRM-M-30472-2025 was instituted to assail the issuance of non-bailable warrants, but the same too was dismissed by this Court on 28.05.2025.

5. The petitioner thereafter assailed the aforesaid orders before the Hon'ble Supreme Court in SLP (Criminal No.8771 of 2025) and SLP (Criminal No.10353 of 2025). Both these petitions too met with no success and were dismissed.

6. Learned Special Public Prosecutor for the CBI, assisted by counsel for the complainant, have submitted that despite repeated and adequate opportunities extended by the Trial Court, the petitioner wilfully failed to appear, thereby compelling the Court to issue non-



CRM-M-40203-2025

bailable warrants. Consequent upon his continued non-appearance, the petitioner was declared a proclaimed offender vide order dated 15.07.2025 under Section 84 of the BNSS. The proclamation is stated to have been duly executed in accordance with the procedure prescribed under law.

7. In response, learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the proclamation was affixed at the ancestral village of the petitioner in Meerut, despite the fact that he resides in New Delhi. It is further submitted that the petitioner was medically unwell during the relevant period, which prevented his appearance before the Trial Court. Reliance has been placed on certain medical certificates and Aadhaar Card records annexed with the petition, in support of his alleged illness and residential address.

8. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material on record, this Court is of the view that no ground for interference is made out.

9. The record clearly demonstrates that the petitioner was fully aware of the criminal proceedings pending against him, yet he deliberately chose not to join the investigation or present himself before the Trial Court, despite the grant of sufficient opportunities. His persistent absence not only necessitated the issuance of non-bailable warrants but ultimately resulted in his being declared a proclaimed offender under Section 84 BNSS. The due process leading to such declaration appears to have been meticulously followed.

10. The plea of illness by the petitioner remains



CRM-M-40203-2025

unsubstantiated by any credible or persuasive material. The medical documents placed on record do not inspire confidence, particularly in light of the petitioner's continued pattern of avoidance and his failure to furnish any prior intimation to the Trial Court regarding his purported medical condition. This belated plea is evidently an afterthought and does not mitigate his conscious and prolonged default.

11. Viewed in its entirety, such abuse of process aimed at securing interim indulgences while evading the core issue of participation in the trial deserves to be deprecated.

12. This Court, therefore, finds no infirmity, procedural or otherwise in the impugned order dated 15.07.2025. The same appears to have been passed after due compliance with the statutory mandate under Section 84 of BNSS. Accordingly, the instant petition is hereby dismissed.

13. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

28.07.2025

Vinay

**(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No