

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

SR. No.139

CRM-M-24610-2022

Date of Decision:31.05.2022

Brij Lal

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

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

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J. (Oral)

This is a petition under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. for quashing the FIR No.0197 dated 11.04.2022 registered under Section 174-A IPC (Annexure P-2) at Police Station Civil Lines, Sirsa.

The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that respondent No.2 filed a complaint bearing No. NACT-432-2018 under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 (for short 'Act of 1881') against the petitioner before the learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, Sirsa with the allegation that the petitioner had issued two cheques amounting to Rs.2,00,000/- and Rs.2,50,0000/- in favour of respondent No.2. However, the same, on presentation, were dishonoured with the remarks "FUNDS INSUFFICIENT". The petitioner was ordered to be summoned under the Act of 1881. During the pendency of the proceedings before the learned Trial Court, the petitioner could not appear on 04.04.2022 and accordingly, he was declared proclaimed person by the learned Trial Court vide order dated 04.04.2022. He next submitted that

with the intervention of the respectable persons, the petitioner compromised the matter with the complainant/respondent No.2, pursuant to which the complaint in question has already been dismissed as withdrawn in view of statement dated 24.05.2022 made by the complainant and proceedings regarding proclamation have been dropped against the petitioner.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Vikrant Pamboo, DAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1-State, while Mr. Mandeep Singh Gill, Advocate, accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.2-complainant and admits the fact that a compromise has been effected between the parties, and the complaint stands withdrawn.

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

From the above-said facts and circumstances, it is apparent that the present FIR was registered in view of the fact that the petitioner was declared as a proclaimed person in the proceeding under Section 138 of the Act of 1881. The impugned complaint under Section 138 of the Act of 1881 itself has been withdrawn.

In similar circumstances as in the present case 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 an FIR had been registered under Section 174-A IPC, in view of the order passed in proceedings under Section 138 of the Act of 1881, 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 of 1881 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 considerations for allowing the petition and setting aside the order declaring the petitioner therein as a proclaimed

person as well as quashing of the FIR under Section 174-A IPC.

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.

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- 2021 decided on 19.04.2022”**.

In the present case the proceedings under Section 138 of the Act of 1881 have culminated in a settlement with the withdrawal of the

complaint under Section 138 of the Act of 1881.

In view of the above, the present petition is allowed and the
FIR No.0197 dated 11.04.2022 registered under Section 174-A IPC
(Annexure P-2) at Police Station Civil Lines, Sirsa is hereby quashed.

31.05.2022
mks

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES / NO

Whether Reportable: YES / NO