

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

**CRM-M-61639-2018 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 20.12.2018**

Harinder Singh and another

.....PETITIONER(s).

VERSUS

State of Haryana and another

.....RESPONDENT(s).

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI

Present: Mr. Alok Mittal, Advocate
for the petitioners.

RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI, J.(Oral)

This is a petition under Section 482 of Code of Criminal Procedure for quashing FIR No.148 dated 11.10.2018 registered under Sections 406, 420, 467, 468, 471 of Indian Penal code at Police Station Baragudha, District Sirsa along with all subsequent and consequential proceedings arising out the FIR.

It has been submitted that certain cheques were given by the petitioners to discharge their liability. However, two of them were honoured and the remaining were dishonoured solely on the ground that the petitioners have forged their own signatures.

Prima facie case is made out that the petitioners made a forgery by committing own signatures. Due to this reason, the cheques were dishonoured.

Reliance has been placed on the judgment of this Court passed in CRL-M-28634-2006 titled as Charanjit Singh Chawla v. State of Punjab decided on 23.1.2009 but to the mind of this Court, the facts of that case are distinguishable.

The Hon'ble Supreme Court in **State of Haryana and others v. Ch. Bhajan Lal and Ors.**, 1992 AIR (SC) 604 has made the following observations:-

“In the backdrop of the interpretation of the various relevant provisions of the Code under Chapter XIV and of the principles of law enunciated by this Court in a series of decisions relating to the exercise of the extraordinary power under Article 226 or the inherent powers under Section 482 of the Code which we have extracted and reproduced above, we give the following categories of cases by way of illustration wherein such power could be exercised either to prevent abuse of the process of any Court or otherwise to secure the ends of justice, though it may not be possible to lay down any precise, clearly defined and sufficiently channelised and inflexible guidelines or rigid formulae and to give an exhaustive list of myriad kinds of cases wherein such power should be exercised.

1. Whether the allegations made in the First Information Report or the complaint, even if they are taken at their face value and accepted in their entirety do not prima facie constitute

any offence or make out a case against the accused.

2. Where the allegations in the First Information Report and other materials, if any, accompanying the F.I.R. do not disclose a cognizable offence, justifying an investigation by police officers under Section 156 (1) of the Code except under an order of a Magistrate within the purview of Section 155 (2) of the Code.

3. Where the uncontroverted allegations made in the FIR or complaint and the evidence collected in support of the same do not disclose the commission of any offence and make out a case against the accused.

4. Whether, the allegations in the F.I.R. do not constitute a cognizable offence but constitute only a non-cognizable offence, no investigation is permitted by a police officer without an order of a Magistrate as contemplated under Section 155 (2) of the Code.

5. Where the allegations made in the F.I.R. or complaint are so absurd and inherently improbable on the basis of which no prudent person can ever reach a just conclusion that

there is sufficient ground for proceeding against the accused.

6. Where there is an express legal bar engrafted in any of the provisions of the Code or the concerned Act (under which a criminal proceeding is instituted) to the institution and continuance of the proceedings and/or where there is a specific provision in the Code or the concerned Act, providing efficacious redress for the grievance of the aggrieved party.

7. Where a criminal proceeding is manifestly attended with mala fide and/or where the proceeding is maliciously instituted with an ulterior motive for wreaking vengeance on the accused and with a view to spite him due to private and personal grudge.”

No case is made out for interference by this Court.

Dismissed.

However, nothing expressed above shall affect the merits of the case.

December 20, 2018
Paritosh Kumar

(RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned:</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable:</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>