

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

126

2024:PHHC:009520

CRM-M-3778-2024

Date of decision: January 24th, 2024

Partap Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

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

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

The instant petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of FIR No.1722 dated 17.12.2023 (Annexure P-2) under Section 174-A of the IPC registered at Police Station Civil Lines, Karnal and subsequent proceedings arising therefrom.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, at the outset, has drawn the attention of this Court to order dated 15.01.2024 (Annexure P-4), wherein it stands reflected that in view of a statement made by the complainant, the complaint under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 (for short, 'the NI Act') was dismissed as withdrawn on the basis of a compromise. A prayer, therefore, has been made that in the aforementioned facts and circumstances, no purpose would be served by prosecuting the petitioner under Section 174-A of the IPC. In support of his submissions, learned counsel has placed reliance upon the judgment of this Court in ***Sher Singh vs. State of Haryana (CRM-M-11846-2023) decided on 09.03.2023*** wherein in identical facts and circumstances, the FIR registered under

3. Notice of motion.
4. On asking of the Court, Ms. Trishanjali Sharma, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1-State.
5. Mr. Sanjay, Advocate, for Mr. Dixit Vashisht, Advocate, has entered appearance on behalf of respondent No.2 and has filed power of attorney, which is taken on record.
6. Learned counsel for complainant-respondent No.2 does not dispute the submissions made by the counsel opposite about the matter having been settled and the complainant in question under Section 138 of the N.I. Act having been withdrawn vide order dated 15.01.2024.
7. Learned State counsel has opposed the prayer made by the counsel opposite and contended that it was evident that the petitioner had intentionally not appeared during the proceedings before the Court below and hence, the prayer of the petitioner deserved to be declined.
8. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material on record.
9. The petitioner was declared a proclaimed offender in a complaint case under Section 138 of the NI Act. Admittedly, the said complaint was withdrawn after the parties arrived at a compromise. Hence, continuation of criminal proceedings for offence under Section 174-A of the IPC would serve no useful purpose.
10. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and FIR registered under Section 174-A of the IPC and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom are quashed.

January 24th, 2024

Puneet

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : No