

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

244

**CRM-M-25418-2019 (O&M)
Date of decision: 26.04.2022**

BHAWANI SHANKAR SHARMA AND ORS

....Petitioners(s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANR

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present : Mr. Aditya Grover, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG Haryana.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ. J. (ORAL)

The question that arises for consideration in the instant petition is as to whether an FIR under Section 174-A of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 can be quashed once the substantive complaint wherefrom the proceedings had emanated itself stands settled amongst the parties?

2. The instant petition has been filed under Section 482 Code of Criminal Procedure (hereinafter referred to as 'CrPC') for seeking quashing of the FIR No.1366 of 2017 dated 06.12.2017 (Annexure P-2) under Section 174-A of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 registered at Police Station Faridabad Cenral, District Faridabad, Haryana along with all proceedings arising therefrom.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners has submitted that the issuance of the proclamation was bad and that no actual service had been

affected upon them. He further submitted that procedure contemplated under Section 82 CrPC had not been followed, hence the consequent proclamation of the petitioners was improper. Learned counsel further contends that failure to effect service upon the petitioners apart, the parties have also resolved their dispute and now there is no amount due against the petitioners. In support thereof, he has made reference to the order dated 05.02.2019 passed by Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Faridabad, as per which the complainant got recorded his statement to the effect that compromise between the parties had been affected and had withdrawn the complaint filed by him in acknowledgment of the same. The order dated 05.02.2019 passed by Judicial Magistrate First Class, Faridabad is extracted as under:-

Kunal Conchem Vs. M/s Supreme Infrastructure

Present: Complainant with Sh. Pardeep Rathi, Advocate.

Main file summoned from the record room on an application moved by the complainant for withdrawal of the present complaint. Present case be restored in the CIS. Complainant has made the statement that the matter has been compromised with the accused and he has received full and final payment from the accused and now there is no dues towards the complainant and therefore, he does not want to pursue with the present complaint and withdraw the same. Statement recorded separately. Heard. In view of the statement made by the complainant, present complaint is hereby dismissed as withdrawn. File be consigned to record room after compliance.

Date of order: 05.02.2019

*(Rakesh Kumar)
Judicial Magistrate Ist Class,
Faridabad*

6. Learned counsel for the petitioners further contends that the

complaint, which was the cause of registration of the instant FIR, has already been settled between the parties and it would not advance any interest of justice to continue incarceration of the petitioners in the instant FIR, which arose due to failure of the petitioners to appear in the proceedings in the said complaint.

7. Learned State counsel raises no serious objection to the arguments raised by the petitioners. There is no denial or dispute regarding the statement made by the parties and the final order passed in the complaint.

8. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record of the case with their able assistance.

9. In order to appreciate the prayer, it would be essential to refer to certain precedent judgements dealing with the similar issue. A co-ordinate Bench of this Court in the matter of **Ashok Madan Vs. State of Haryana & Another**, passed in CRM-M-51783 of 2018 decided on 28.05.2019 held as under:-

6.No doubt, the learned counsel for the respondent has vehemently argued that the offence under Section 174-A IPC 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 petitioners, the default stood condoned. In such circumstances, continuation of proceedings under Section 174-A IPC shall be abuse of the process of court.

10. Further in the matter of **Prem Bansal Vs. State of Haryana & Another** passed in CRM-M-7354 of 2022 decided on 22.02.2022, a co-ordinate Bench of this Court held as under:-

'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 petitioners 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 of the IPC in view of the order passed in proceedings under Section 138 of the Act of 1881, while declaring the petitioners therein as proclaimed offender in the said proceedings, 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 of the 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 petitioners therein as proclaimed person as well as quashing of the FIR under Section 174-A of the 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 petitioners, 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.”

11. A perusal of the same would show that where the substantive proceedings, wherein the order declaring the petitioners-accused as proclaimed person was passed, have already been amicably resolved amongst the parties, resulting in withdrawal of the complaint or the quashing of the proceedings, the FIR registered under Section 174-A IPC, as a result of certain interim order passed in criminal proceedings, have also been quashed. The object being to secure presence of an accused and to establish rule of law so that the proceedings could be finalized. Once the parent dispute stands amicably resolved, the proceedings initiated as a result of intermediary orders would not sub-serve any interest of justice. The proceedings under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 being quasi-criminal, the object is to resolve the dispute and when such object is served, the Court should adopt a liberal approach towards the accused who has already redressed the grievance of the complainant.

12. Without going into the controversy as to whether the service was correctly and properly effected upon the petitioners in the instant case or not at this stage, and after noticing that the main case already stands settled in view of compromise executed between the parties and the complaint having been withdrawn, the registration of the instant FIR, that is only an outcome of the proceeding held in the said compliant, would not serve any purpose by keeping the present FIR and other proceedings alive.

13. The instant petition is accordingly allowed and FIR No.1366 of 2017 dated 06.12.2017 (Annexure P-2) under Section 174-A of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 registered at Police Station Faridabad Cenral, District Faridabad, Haryana along with all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom are **quashed** and the

orders dated 02.08.2017 and 29.11.2017 passed by the Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Faridabad, vide which the petitioners had been declared as proclaimed person are **set aside**. However, the same would be subject to payment of costs of Rs.20,000/- to be deposited by the petitioners with the '**Punjab and Haryana High Court Bar Clerks Association, Chandigarh**, within one month from receipt of certified copy of this order.

Petition is allowed.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

April 26, 2022
S.Sharma(syr)

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