

2023:PHHC:133958

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

204

CRM-M-34858-2023

Date of decision : 11.10.2023

Harjinder Singh**..... Petitioner****versus****State of Punjab and another****..... Respondents****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN**

Present: Mr. Prashant Bansal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Tarun Aggarwal, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Sandeep Sharma, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. seeking quashing of FIR No.244 dated 18.09.2019, registered for offence punishable under Section 174-A of IPC at Police Station City Rajpura, District Patiala.

2. Petitioner was summoned to face trial for offence punishable under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 and was declared proclaimed person vide order dated 28.08.2019. It has been claimed that subsequent thereto, the principal complaint i.e. the one filed by respondent No.2 qua offence punishable under Section 138 of the Act stands withdrawn vide order dated 14.05.2022.

3. The aforesaid facts as stated in the petition are admitted by the counsel representing respondent No.2.

2023:PHHC:133958

4. Thus, the question arises before this Court whether the proceedings under Section 174-A that came into being after the petitioner was declared as proclaimed person in proceedings under Section 138 of the Act on the strength of order dated 28.08.2019 can be allowed to continue in view of the fact that principal offence already stands compromised/compounded. The question is no more res integra, same has been answered by 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 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.*

2023:PHHC:133958

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

2023:PHHC:133958

petition is allowed. FIR No.244 dated 18.09.2019, registered for offence punishable under Section 174-A of IPC at Police Station City Rajpura, District Patiala is hereby quashed qua the petitioner.

(PANKAJ JAIN)
JUDGE

11.10.2023
Dinesh

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes
Whether Reportable :	No