

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

CRM-M-4019-2018

Date of decision : 14.10.2022

Kuljit Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present : Mr. Maninder Arora, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Madhur Sharma, Asstt. Advocate General, Punjab
for the respondent/State.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (ORAL)

By way of present petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. , the petitioner is seeking quashing FIR No.32 dated 23rd of February, 2016, registered for the offence punishable under Section 174A of the IPC, at Police Station Navi Baradari, Jalandhar City, Punjab (Annexure P-1) and proceedings subsequent thereto.

2. Ld. Counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner was summoned to face trial u/s 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 (for short, the N.I. Act) wherein he was declared a Proclaimed Offender leading to the registration of present FIR. He refers to Annexure P-2 to submit that the principal proceedings u/s 138 of the N.I. Act already stand compounded and the complainant has withdrawn the complaint vide order dated 30th of May, 2017 placed on record as Annexure P-2. He, thus, submits that after

compounding of offence u/s 138 of the N.I. Act, the continuation of the proceedings under the impugned FIR shall amount to abuse of process of law.

3. Ld. State Counsel admits that fact that the principal complaint filed u/s 138 of the N.I. Act stands withdrawn.

4. The question w.r.t. continuation of the proceedings u/s 174A IPC after the complaint filed u/s 138 of the N.I. Act already stands compromised is no more *res integra* and already stands answered by Coordinate Bench of this Court in CRM-M-43813-2018 titled as “**Baldev Chand Bansal Vs. State of Haryana and another**” vide order dated 29.01.2019, which 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.”

xx xxx xxxx

*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.

xx xxx xxxx

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."

5. Same is the view of another Co-ordinate Bench in the “**Ashok Madaan vs. State of Haryana and another**” reported as 2020 (4) RCR (Criminal) 87, wherein it has been held that:

“No doubt, the learned counsel for the respondent has vehemently argued that the offence under Section 174-A 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.”

6. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case and in view of the principles settled by this Court, the present petition is allowed. FIR No.32 dated 23rd of February, 2016, registered for the offence punishable under Section 174A of the IPC, at Police Station Navi Baradari, Jalandhar City, Punjab (Annexure P-1), and proceedings subsequent thereto are hereby quashed *qua* the present petitioner.

October 14, 2022
Dpr

(PANKAJ JAIN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No