



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

**CRM-M-38513-2025 (O&M)  
Date of Decision: 22.07.2025**

**MAUJI RAM**

**...Petitioner**

**V/S**

**STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS**

**...Respondents**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR**

Present: Mr. Babbar Bhan, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gagandeep Singh Chhina, Sr. DAG Haryana.

\*\*\*\*

**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 02.07.2025 (Annexure P-8) passed by learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Pataudi vide which the petitioner has been declared as proclaimed person in case bearing FIR No. 368 dated 14.09.2023 registered under Sections 420, 468, 471, 120-B of of Indian Penal Code (for short 'IPC') (Section 467 of IPC added later on) at Police Station Farrukh Nagar, District Gurugram.

2. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that the petitioner was granted the concession of anticipatory bail by this Court vide order dated 25.06.2025 (Annexure P-5). Thereafter, the complainant had filed an application i.e. CIS No. APP/197/2024 before the learned Illaqa Magistrate for seeking the status report in the present case and thereafter learned trial Court entertained the said application and the prosecution/police also filed an application for issuance of proclamation against the present petitioner. Thereafter, learned Illaqa Magistrate ordered that proceedings under Sections 82 and 83 of Cr.P.C. be initiated against the present petitioner and proclamation was issued against him and eventually



vide the impugned order dated 02.07.2025 (Annexure P-8), the petitioner was declared as proclaimed person. Learned counsel further contends that petitioner was declared as absconder from law 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. Gagandeep Singh Chhina, Sr. DAG Haryana, 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 02.07.2025 (Annexures P-8) vide which the petitioner was declared as proclaimed person, is hereby set 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 PGIMER Poor Patient Welfare Fund, Chandigarh for wasting precious time of the Court.



**CRM-M-38513-2025 (O&M)**

**-4-**

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.

22.07.2025  
*Ajay Goswami*

**(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)**  
**JUDGE**

*Whether speaking/reasoned*  
*Whether reportable*

*Yes/No*  
*Yes/No*