



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

**CRM-M-38902-2025
Date of decision: 24.07.2025**

MANVIR SINGH

...PETITIONER

V/S

STATE OF PUNJAB

...RESPONDENT


CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Gurmehar Singh Manhas, Advocate for the petitioner.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. This is the first petition filed under Section 528 Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023 seeking quashing of impugned order dated 31.05.2018 passed by learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Kapurthala (Annexure P-2), whereby the petitioner was declared as proclaimed person in case stemming from FIR No.52 dated 02.10.2009 registered under Sections 307, 326, 325, 324, 323, 148, 149 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Dhilwan, District Kapurthala.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner was on bail and was regularly appearing before the learned trial Court. Thereafter, an oral settlement took place between the parties and the petitioner was left under the impression that the matter has been compromised, due to which he did not appear before the trial Court. Subsequently, the learned trial Court vide order dated 31.05.2019 declared the petitioner as proclaimed person. Learned counsel further submits that all other accused facing the trial, have already been acquitted vide judgment dated 20.11.2018 passed by learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Kapurthala (Annexure P-3) as none of the prosecution



witnesses supported the case its case. Furthermore, the case of the petitioner is squarely covered by the judgment passed by Division Bench of this Court in ***Sudo Mandal @ Diwarak Mandal vs. State of Punjab 2011(2) RCR (Criminal) 453.***


3. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that proclamation was issued against the petitioner without following the drill of Section 82 Cr.P.C. and non-compliance of the mandatory provisions vitiates the entire proceedings, which suffers from incurable illegality as he was never served and the impugned order is liable to be set aside.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Subhash Godara, Addl. A.G., Punjab, who is present in the Court, accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State and supports the order passed by the learned trial Court by contending that the petitioner did not put in appearance before the trial Court intentionally and deliberately and, therefore, having left with no other option, proclamation was issued to secure his presence.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record of the case with their able assistance, the matter is taken up for final disposal.

7. While the scheme of criminal justice system necessitates curtailment of personal liberty to some extent, it is of the utmost importance that the same is done in line with the procedure established by law to maintain a healthy balance between personal liberty of the individual-accused and interests of the society in promoting law and order. Such procedure must be compatible with Article 21 of the Constitution of India i.e. it must be fair, just and not suffer from the vice of arbitrariness or unreasonableness.




8. A perusal of the impugned order reveals that the trial Court issued proclamation without recording reasons of its belief that the petitioner has absconded or is concealing himself. This Court in the judgment passed in ***Major Singh @ Major Vs. State of Punjab 2023 (3) RCR (Criminal) 406; 2023 (2) Law Herald 1506*** has held that the Court is first required to record its satisfaction before issuance of process under Section 82 of Cr.P.C. and non-recording of the satisfaction itself makes such order suffering from incurable illegality. In the judgment passed by this Court in ***Sonu Vs. State of Haryana 2021 (1) RCR (Crl.) 319***, it has been held that the conditions specified in Section 82 (2) Cr.P.C. 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.

9. The sole purpose of issuance of non-bailable warrants or issuance of proclamation is to secure presence of the accused before the trial Court. The petitioner in the present case has himself come forward.

10. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances and in view of the ratio of law laid down in ***Major Singh @ Major (supra)***, the present petition is allowed and the impugned order dated 31.05.2018 (Annexure P-2), vide which, the petitioner was declared as proclaimed person is quashed.

11. The petitioner is directed to appear before the trial Court within a period of six weeks from today and on his doing so, he shall be admitted to bail on his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court, along with costs of Rs.20,000/- to be deposited with the All India Pingalwara Charitable Society, Makdoom Pura, Jalandhar for wasting precious time of the Court.



12. Receipt of payment of cost must be presented before learned trial Court and learned trial Court is directed to verify the same.

13. It is made clear that in case, the petitioner fails to appear before the trial Court within a stipulated period, the interim protection granted by this Court shall be deemed to be vacated.

July 24, 2025
manisha

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

- | | | |
|------|---------------------------|--------|
| (i) | Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| (ii) | Whether reportable | Yes/No |