



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

CRM-M-10801-2020

Date of Decision: 15.10.2024

Sanjeev Badhwar

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana and Anr.

...Respondents

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S. Shekhawat

Present: Mr. Ivan Singh Khosa, Advocate
 for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajinder Kumar Banku, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 482 of Cr. P.C with a prayer to quash the FIR No. 477 dated 31.12.2019, under Sections 174-A of IPC, registered at Police Station Naraingarh, District Amabala, Haryana (Annexure P-3) and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that a complaint No. NACT-30-2018, under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act (hereinafter referred to as the "Act") was filed by the respondent No.2 against the petitioner in the Court of Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Naraingarh. During the course of trial, the petitioner was never served and ultimately, vide order dated 02.12.2019 (Annexure P-2), the petitioner was declared to be a proclaimed person by the Court of Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Naraingarh. On the orders of the Trial Court, FIR No. 477 dated 31.12.2019, under Sections 174-A of IPC, Police Station Naraingarh, District Amabala, Haryana was



registered against the present petitioner. In January, 2020, the petitioner came to know about the pendency of the proceedings under Section 138 of the “Act” against him and he entered into a MOU (Annexure P-4) with respondent No.2/complainant. Ultimately, on 29.02.2020 (Annexure P-6), the respondent No.2/complainant had withdrawn the criminal complaint from the Court of Sub-Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Naraingarh. Learned counsel further contends that the very purpose of the impugned FIR was to procure the presence of the petitioner and since the main matter has already stands compromised between the parties, the proceedings arising out of impugned order (Annexure P-2) and the FIR (Annexure P-3) are liable to be quashed by this Court.

3. 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 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.

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.”

4. A perusal of the above judgment would show that in a similar case where the FIR had been registered under Section 174-A IPC in view of the order passed in proceedings under Section 138 of the Act, while declaring the petitioner therein as a proclaimed offender, a co-ordinate Bench after relying upon various judgments observed that once the main petition 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 IPC is nothing but an abuse of the process of law. The said aspect was one of the main considerations for allowing the petition and setting aside the order declaring the petitioner therein as a proclaimed person as well as quashing of the FIR under Section 174-A IPC.

5. 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 regularized 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. In the present case also, the main case has already been withdrawn by the complainant. Consequently, the continuation of the proceedings arising out of impugned order dated 02.12.2019 (Annexure P-2) would be an abuse of process of the Court. Similar observations have been made by this Court in the matter of “Anil Kumar Versus Jitender Kumar and another, CRM-M- 5878-2022 decided on 06.04.2022”, “Anil Kumar Versus Jitender Kumar and another, CRM-M-5755-2022 decided on 06.04.2022” and “Varinder Kumar @ Virender Kumar Versus State of Haryana and another, CRM-M-42551- 2021 decided on 19.04.2022” .

7. In view of the above, the present petition is allowed and impugned order dated 02.12.2019 (Annexure P-2), alongwith all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom is hereby ordered to be quashed.

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

15.10.2024
hitesh

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