

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

CRM-M-34034-2022

Date of decision : 23.08.2023

PREETI

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present : Mr. Khushita Setia, Advocate for
Mr. S.S. Sarwara, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. H.S. Sullar, Sr. DAG, Punjab
for respondent No.1-State

Ms. Komalpreet Kaur, ADvocate for
Mr. Jaswinder Singh, Advocate for respondent No.2.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (ORAL)

By way of present petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C., the petitioner is seeking quashing of FIR No.335 dated 12.12.2019 registered for the offence punishable under Section 174-A of the IPC, at Police Station Rajpura, District Patiala (Annexure P-2) and all proceedings subsequent thereto.

2. The petitioner herein was summoned to face trial under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 (for short, 'the N.I. Act'). On account of her lapse, she was declared Proclaimed Person which led to the registration of present FIR under Section 174-A IPC.

3. Ld. Counsel for the petitioner submits that the principal proceedings initiated against the petitioner for offence punishable under

Section 138 of the N.I. Act stand settled and the complaint preferred against the petitioner stands withdrawn. Reference has been made to the order passed by the JMIC, Rajpura, dated 7th of March, 2020, which reads as under :

“File summoned from record room as accused Preeti surrendered in the court. The complainant also appeared and suffered a statement that the accused has paid him the cheque amount and therefore he does not want to pursue the present complaint against the accused and sought permission for withdrawing the complaint. In view of the statement of the complainant, the present complaint is dismissed as withdrawn. Accused is accordingly discharged.

Since an FIR no. 335 dated 12.12.2019 has been registered against the accused u/s 174-A of IPC in police station City Rajpura, the accused is handed over to the Naib Court to hand her over to the officials of police station City Rajpura. File be consigned to record room.”

In the aforesaid circumstances, counsel for the petitioner contends that continuation of the present proceedings under Section 174-A IPC shall amount to an abuse of process of law.

4. Having heard counsel for the parties, in the considered opinion of this Court the question '*as to whether proceedings under Section 174-A IPC can be allowed to continue after the principal complaint filed under Section 138 of the N.I. Act already stands settled and withdrawn*', is no more *res integra* and has been answered by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in **CRM-M-43813-2018** titled as “**Baldev Chand Bansal Vs. State of Haryana and another**” vide order dated 29th of Janaury, 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.335 dated 12.12.2019 registered for the offence punishable under Section 174-A of the IPC, at Police Station Rajpura, District Patiala (Annexure P-2) and all proceedings subsequent thereto, are hereby quashed *qua* the present petitioner.

August 23, 2023
Dpr

(PANKAJ JAIN)
JUDGE

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