

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

(250-A)

CRM-M-29260-2018
Date of Decision:-05.05.2022

Jagdeep Virk

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana & another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present: Mr. Inderjeet Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Parveen Kumar Aggarwal, DAG, Haryana.

None for respondent No.2.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J. (Oral)

The prayer in the present petition is for quashing the order 23.07.2009, whereby the petitioner has been declared as a proclaimed person (Annexure P-1) in a complaint case No.NIA/45/2/2006 (NIA 610/2018) dated 03.02.2006, filed under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act.

The brief facts of the case are that the petitioner came to be summoned in the aforementioned case complaint and was declared as a proclaimed person vide impugned order (Annexure P-1). It is submitted that the petitioner was never served in the said proceedings and he learnt about the same only after the police raided his house, after being declared as a proclaimed person. On learning about the same, the petitioner compromised the matter with the complainant/respondent No.2. Thereafter, on 20.03.2018, the learned counsel for the complainant in the Trial Court got recorded his statement that as per his instructions, the complainant-bank did not want to proceed further with the present complaint and wants to withdraw the same. Based on the said statement, the complaint was

CRM-M-29260-2018

dismissed as withdrawn on 20.03.2018 (Annexure P-2).

As per office report, respondent No.2 has been served. However, despite service none has appeared on behalf of respondent No.2.

The learned State counsel has opposed the present petition and has submitted that the complaint has been correctly registered.

This Court has heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned State counsel and has perused the paper-book.

From the above-said facts and circumstances, it is apparent that the impugned complaint under Section 138 of the Act of 1881 itself has been withdrawn.

A Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in **CRM-M-43813-2018** titled as “**Baldev Chand Bansal vs. State of Haryana and another**”, decided on 29.01.2019 has held as under:-

“Prayer in this petition is for quashing of FIR No.64 dated 15.02.2017 filed under Section 174-A of the Indian Penal Code registered at Police Station Sector-5, Panchkula and all other subsequent proceedings arising thereof as well as order dated 24.10.2016 passed by the trial Court vide which a direction was issued to register the aforesaid FIR.

xxx xxx xxx

*Learned counsel for the petitioner has relied upon the decisions rendered by this Court in “ **Vikas Sharma vs. Gurpreet Singh Kohli and another (supra)**, 2017, (3) L.A.R.584, **Microqual Techno Limited and others Vs. State of Haryana and another**, 2015 (32) RCR (Crl.) 790 and “**Rajneesh Khanna Vs. State of Haryana and another**”*

2017(3) L.A.R. 555 wherein in an identical circumstance, this Court has held that since the main petition filed under Section 138 of the Act stands withdrawn in view of an amicable settlement between the parties, therefore, continuation of proceedings under Section 174A of IPC shall be nothing but an abuse of the process of law.

xxx xxx xxx

In view of the same, I find merit in the present petition and accordingly, present petition is allowed and the impugned order dated 24.10.2016 passed by Judicial Magistrate, 1st Class, Panchkula as well as FIR No.64 dated 15.02.2017 registered under Section 174-A of the Indian Penal Code at Police Station Sector-5, Panchkula and all other subsequent proceedings arising thereof, are hereby quashed.”

A perusal of the above judgment would show that in a similar case where the FIR had been registered under Section 174-A IPC after the accused was declared a proclaimed person in view of the order passed in proceedings under Section 138 of the Act, while declaring the petitioner therein as proclaimed offender, a co-ordinate Bench after relying upon various judgments observed that once the main petition under Section 138 of the Act stands withdrawn in view of an amicable settlement between the parties, the continuation of proceedings under Section 174-A IPC is nothing but an abuse of the process of law. The said aspect was one of the main consideration for allowing the petition and setting aside the order declaring the petitioner therein as proclaimed person as well as quashing of the FIR under Section 174-A IPC.

CRM-M-29260-2018

Another co-ordinate Bench of this Court in a case titled as ***“Ashok Madan vs. State of Haryana and another”*** reported as **2020(4) RCR (Criminal) 87** has also held as under:-

“No doubt, the learned counsel for the respondent has vehemently argued that the offence under Section 174A I.P.C. is independent of the main case, therefore, merely because the main case has been dismissed for want of prosecution, the present petition cannot be allowed, however, keeping in view the fact that the present FIR was registered only on account of absence from the proceedings in the main case which had been subsequently regularised by the court while granting bail to the petitioner, the default stood condoned. In such circumstances, continuation of proceedings under Section 174A I.P.C. Shall be abuse of the process of court.

7. Accordingly, the petition is allowed. FIR No.446 dated 21.08.2017, registered under Section 174A I.P.C. At Police Station Kotwali, District Faridabad, as well as consequential proceedings shall stand quashed.”

A perusal of the relevant extract of the above judgment would show that where the main case was dismissed for want of prosecution, it was observed that the continuation of proceedings under Section 174-A IPC shall be an abuse of the process of court. A similar view has been expressed by this Court in “Anil Kumar Versus Jitender Kumar and another, CRM-M-5878-2022 decided on 06.04.2022”, “Anil Kumar Versus Jitender Kumar and another, CRM-M-5755-2022 decided on 06.04.2022” and “Varinder Kumar @ Virender Kumar Versus State of Haryana and another, CRM-M-42551-

CRM-M-29260-2018

2021 decided on 19.04.2022 Gurcharan Kaur Versus State of Haryana and another, CRM-M-9010-2021, decided on 21.04.2022 ”.

In the present case the proceedings under Section 138 NI Act have culminated in a settlement with the withdrawal of the complaint under Section 138 NI Act.

In view of the above, the present petition is allowed and the order dated 23.07.2009, declaring the petitioner as a proclaimed person (Annexure P-1), is hereby set aside.

05.05.2022

Jitesh

**(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned:-

Yes/No

Whether Reportable:-

Yes/No