

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

127

CRM-M-16793-2024

Date of decision: 05.04.2024

Shakir Ali

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. Saleem Ahmed, Advocate for the petitioner.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of order dated 29.11.2023 (Annexure P-1) passed by learned Trial Court in Criminal Complaint bearing No.NACT-80 dated 22.05.2017 under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 (for short, 'the NI Act') titled as 'Jan Mohd. Vs. Shakir', whereby the petitioner has been declared a proclaimed person.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has primarily prayed for setting aside of the impugned order on the ground that he was never served either with the summons or warrants issued by the Trial Court in the complaint instituted under Section 138 of the NI Act. Learned counsel, therefore, submits that absence of the petitioner was thus, not intentional as he was unaware about the pendency of the complaint instituted against him under Section 138 of the NI Act and still further, even the proclamation was never served upon him as per the provisions of Section 82 Cr.P.C. Learned counsel has vehemently contended that as soon as the petitioner learnt about the pendency of the complaint in

question, he immediately made the payment of the cheque amount to the complainant and compromised the matter with him. Resultantly, the complaint instituted under Section 138 of the NI Act by the complainant, was withdrawn by him on 07.03.2024. In support, he has drawn the attention of this Court to Annexure P-2 wherein it stands reflected that the matter stood amicably settled between the parties and the complaint stood withdrawn. A prayer therefore, has been made that in the aforementioned facts and circumstances, impugned order be set aside.

3. Notice of motion.

4. On asking of the Court, Ms. Trishanjali Sharma, DAG, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State.

5. 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.

6. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material on record.

7. The petitioner was declared a proclaimed person vide impugned order in a complaint case under Section 138 of the NI Act. Admittedly, the said complaint was withdrawn after the parties arrived at a compromise. Furthermore, the petitioner is neither involved in any other criminal case nor was he declared a proclaimed person any time prior thereto. Hence, the continuation of criminal proceedings under would serve no useful purpose.

8. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the impugned order dated 29.11.2023 declaring the petitioner as proclaimed person and consequential proceedings arising therefrom are set aside.

05.04.2024
Vinay

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

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