



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

CRM-M-26203-2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 23.07.2025

HEERA SINGH

...Petitioner

V/S

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Prince Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Subhash Godara, Addl. AG Punjab.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 528 of Bhartiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking quashing of the order dated 17.03.2025 (Annexure P-7) passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Tarn Taran vide which the petitioner has been declared as proclaimed person in case bearing FIR No. 117 dated 22.07.2019 registered under Section 22 of Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 (Section 29 of NDPS Act and Section 489 of IPC added later on) at Police Station Sadar Patti, Tehsil Patti, District Tarn Taran.

2. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that the petitioner was granted regular bail by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Tarn Taran vide order dated 02.09.2019 (Annexure P-3). Thereafter, the petitioner was regularly appearing before the learned trial Court on each and every date of hearing. However, on 11.07.2023, the petitioner could not appear before the learned trial Court due to noting down wrong date of hearing. Thus, on 11.07.2023, learned Additional Sessions Judge, Tarn Tarn, dismissed the bail order of the petitioner and issued non-bailable warrants against him. Thereafter, the petitioner challenged the order dated 11.07.2023



before this Court by filing the quashing petition and the petitioner was directed to surrender before the learned trial Court within a period of one week from the date of order i.e. 30.05.2024 (Annexure P-5) and further subject to payment of costs of Rs. 25,000/- to be paid in Punjab and Haryana High Court Bar Association, Chandigarh Account No. 65035682434, SBI High Court Branch, IFSC: SBIN0050306. The petitioner deposited the costs of Rs. 25,000/-, but unfortunately, failed to surrender before the Court concerned due to non-availability of surety. In the meanwhile, the petitioner was declared as proclaimed person vide impugned order dated 17.03.2025 (Annexure P-7). Learned counsel further contends that petitioner was declared as proclaimed person vide the impugned order without following the proper procedure and the impugned order is liable to be set aside on the ground that the mandate of Section 82(1) of Cr.P.C. has not been followed in its letter and spirit by the trial Court as the warrants of arrest were never served to the petitioner.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. Subhash Godara, Addl. AG Punjab, who is present in the Court, accepts notice on behalf of official respondents 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.

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



6. 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.

7. 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.

8. The sole purpose of issuance of non-bailable warrants or issuance of proclamation is to secure presence of the accused before the trial Court.

9. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, the present petition is allowed. The impugned order dated 17.03.2025 (Annexures P-7) vide which the petitioner was declared as proclaimed person, is hereby set



CRM-M-26203-2025 (O&M)

-4-

aside along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom. The petitioner is directed to appear before the trial Court within four weeks 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. 10,000/- to be deposited with the ***All Indian Pingalwara Charitable Society Jalandhar Branch, Makdoom Pura Dhobi Mohalla, Jalandhar***, for wasting precious time of the Court.

10. The receipt of payment of costs imposed must be presented before learned trial Court. The learned Court below is directed to grant bail to the petitioner only upon verification of payment of said cost.

11. However, in case, the petitioner fails to surrender before the learned Court below within the stipulated time period, the interim protection granted by this Court, shall be deemed to be vacated.

23.07.2025

Ajay Goswami

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No