

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(150)

CRM-M-65156-2023
Date of Decision:-22.12.2023

Inder Raj

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK JAIN

Present: Mr. R.S. Mamli, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Anmol Malik, DAG, Haryana.

ALOK JAIN, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition is for quashing of the FIR No. 1060 dated 10.07.2017 under Section 174-A of IPC, registered at Police Station Jagadhri City (Annexure P-1), in compliance of the order dated 01.07.2017 (Annexure P-2), whereby, the petitioner has been declared proclaimed person in Complaint NIA/2179/2015 dated 21.12.2015 under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instrument Act, 1981 titled as “Oriental Bank of Commerce Vs. Sh. Inder Raj” along with the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, in fact, the main complaint under Section 138 of Negotiable Instruments Act filed against the petitioner was compromised and the order *qua* the same was passed on 09.09.2023 and 12.09.2023 (Annexure P-3). However, due to

CRM-M-65156-2023

-2-

whereby, the petitioner had been declared a proclaimed person was not set aside which led to the filing of the above said FIR.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. Anmol Malik, DAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1-State.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this Court has consistently held that in case where an FIR under Section 174-A has been registered in view of the order passed in proceedings under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, while declaring the petitioner therein as proclaimed offender, once the main complaint under Section 138 of the Act stands withdrawn in view of an amicable settlement between the parties, the continuation of proceedings under Section 174-A of IPC would be nothing but an abuse of process of law.

6. To substantiate his arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner has relied upon the judgment passed by 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, wherein, it has been 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,

CRM-M-65156-2023

-3-

Microqual Techno Limited and others Vs. State of Haryana and another, 2015 (32) RCR (CrI.) 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.”

7. In support of his arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner has further relied upon the following judgments passed by the Co-ordinate Benches of this Court:-

- (i) CRM-M-53195-2022 titled as “Nirmaljit Singh Vs. State of Haryana and others” reported as 2023 (244) AIC 676
- (ii) CRM-M-59826-2022 titled as “Subhash Vs. State of Haryana and another, reported as 2023 (3) R.C.R. (Criminal) 722
- (iii) CRM-M-47657-2022 titled as “Randhir Singh Tyagi Vs. State of Haryana and another”, reported as 2022 (3) DCR 694

8. This Court has heard the learned counsel for the parties at length.

9. Keeping in view the above facts and circumstances as well as

the authorities of law referred to hereinabove, the present petition is

CRM-M-65156-2023

-4-

squarely covered and hence, allowed. Consequently, FIR No. 1060 dated 10.07.2017 registered under Section 174-A of Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Jagadhri City (Annexure P-1) and all the subsequent proceedings emanating therefrom are quashed.

(ALOK JAIN)
JUDGE

December 22, 2023
joyti

Whether speaking/reasoned:-	Yes/No
Whether Reportable:-	Yes/No