

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

her bank to stop payment, as is evidenced by an email, which has been annexed as Annexure P-4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has asserted that in the absence of any legally enforceable debt, the complaint in question (Annexure P-1) and consequent summoning order deserve to be quashed.

3. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and perused the relevant material available on record.

4. The petitioner has raised contentious questions of fact that fall outside the scope of this Court's inherent jurisdiction under Section 482 Cr.PC. Admittedly, the petitioner has not disputed her signatures on the cheque in question. However, the question of whether the disputed cheque was issued in discharge of any legally enforceable debt or liability or still further, whether the petitioner was coerced into signing it by the respondent-complainant, are all issues, which would be put to test during trial when evidence is presented by the parties.

5. As a sequel to the above, this Court would not be inclined to delve into the veracity or otherwise of the allegations levelled by the respondent-complainant at this stage. Accordingly, the present petition stands dismissed.

6. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

22.04.2024  
sonia

Whether speaking/non-speaking?  
Whether reportable?

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)  
JUDGE  
Yes/No  
Yes/No