IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA.

Cr. MMO No.920 of 2026
Decided on: 24.08.2026

Jaung Bahadur Bedi ……. Petitioner

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh & Anr ……Respondents

Coram:
Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.
Whether approved for reporting? [1]

For the petitioner : Mr. Sanjeev Kumar Suri, Advocate.

For the respondents : Mr. Rajan Kahol, Mr. Vishal Panwar, Additional Advocates General with Mr. Ravi Chauhan and Mr. Anish Banstu, Deputy Advocates General for respondent No.1-State.

None for respondent No.2

Sandeep Sharma, Judge (oral):

Notice. Mr. Rajan Kahol, learned Additional Advocate General, appears and waives service of notice on behalf of respondent No.1-State.

2. Being aggrieved and dissatisfied with order dated 01.06.2026 passed by learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Nadaun, District Hamirpur, H.P in Complaint Registration No.82 of 2021, whereby petitioner herein, has been declared proclaimed offender, petitioner-accused has approached this Court in the instant proceedings filed under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023 for quashing and setting aside the aforesaid order.

---

[1] *Whether the reporters of the local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?*

High Court of H.P.

::: Downloaded on - 08/11/2026 17:21:21 :::CIS

3. Mr. Rajan Kahol, learned Additional Advocate General, while putting in appearance on behalf of respondent No.1-State, states that since petitioner has been declared proclaimed offender, appropriate remedy, if any, for him is to approach this Court only.

4. Having regard to the nature of order proposed to be passed, this Court sees no necessity to issue notice to respondent No. 2, who otherwise, in the event of notice being issued, would be unnecessarily burdened to engage a lawyer to represent him in the instant case, which can be disposed of on the basis of material already available on record.

5. Since this Court, after having taken note of the averments contained in the petition, has come to a definite view that appropriate remedy, if any, for petitioner is to approach Court below, which has passed impugned dated order 01.06.2026 , however, having taken note of the fact that petitioner has suffered heart attack, coupled with the fact that he is ready and willing to surrender before Court below within a period of 10 days, this Court, without going into merits of the case, deems it fit to dispose of the same with a direction to petitioner to remain present before Court below on **07.09.2026.**

6. Until then, no coercive action shall be taken by police authorities in terms of order dated 01.06.2026. It is made clear that in case petitioner comes present before Court below on 07.09.2026, order dated 01.06.2026 shall remain in abeyance till then, but in case petitioner fails to come present

High Court of H.P.

::: Downloaded on - 08/11/2026 17:21:21 :::CIS

before Court below on the date fixed by this Court, police authority would be at liberty to comply with direction contained in order dated 01.06.2026.

7. Needless to say, this Court has not adjudicated case on merit, rather appropriate order, shall be passed by Court below strictly in accordance with law. The petition stands disposed of along with pending application(s), if any.

(Sandeep Sharma)
Judge

August 24, 2026
(meera)

High Court of H.P.

::: Downloaded on - 08/11/2026 17:21:21 :::CIS