



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

CRM-M-22993-2024

Date of Decision:-09.05.2024

Nitin Jain.

.....Petitioner.

Vs.

State of Haryana & Anr.

.....Respondents.

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present:- Mr. Manish Bansal, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mr. Rupinder Singh Jhand, Additional Advocate General,
Haryana.

Ms. Diksha Sharma, Advocate for the respondent no.2.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J.(ORAL)

This is a petition under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. for quashing of the FIR No.36 of 2018 dated 07.10.2018 registered under Section 174-A of IPC at Police Station BPTP, District Faridabad which was registered consequent to the order 27.09.2018 (Annexure P-1) passed by the Judicial Magistrate, 1st Class, Faridabad declaring the petitioner as proclaimed person in a complaint case under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881.

2. The brief facts of the case are that in discharge of his legal liability, the petitioner/accused issued a cheque No.530018 dated 22.08.2016 for an amount of Rs.15,00,000/- in favour of respondent No.2/complainant. The said cheque came to be dishonoured. Pursuant thereto, as no payment was made in lieu of the dishonoured cheque, a complaint under Section 138



of Negotiable Instruments Act came to be instituted against the petitioner/accused and he was summoned to face trial. Subsequently, he was declared a proclaimed person vide order dated 27.09.2018 (Annexure P-1).

3. Thereafter, during the pendency of the appeal, a compromise was effected between the parties and the offence was ordered to be compounded in terms of the order dated 07.03.2024 (Annexure P-11) passed by the Sessions Judge, Faridabad. In view of the fact that the offence in question stands compounded on the basis of the compromise, the present petition for quashing of aforesaid FIR No.36 of 2018 dated 07.10.2018 registered under Section 174-A of IPC at Police Station BPTP, District Faridabad came to be filed.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner/accused submits that he had wrongly been declared a proclaimed person and on learning about the same, the petitioner compromised the matter with respondent No.2/complainant. Thereafter, the entire amount had been paid to respondent No.2/complainant. Based on the same, the offence in question stands compounded in terms of the order dated 07.03.2024 (Annexure P-11).

5. Notice of motion.

6. On the asking of the Bench, Mr. Rupinder Singh Jhand, Additional Advocate General, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the State whereas Ms. Diskha Sharma, Advocate accepts notice on behalf of the respondent no.2-Complainant.

7. The learned State counsel has opposed the present petition and has submitted that the FIR has rightly been registered.

8. This Court has heard the learned counsel for the parties and has perused the paper-book.



9. From the above-said facts and circumstances, it is apparent that the present FIR was registered in view of the fact that the petitioner was declared as a proclaimed person in the proceeding under the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881. The impugned complaint itself has been withdrawn.

10. 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.”

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.

11. 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 regularised 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.”

12. A perusal of the relevant extract of the above judgment would show that where the main case was dismissed for want of prosecution, it was observed that the continuation of proceedings under Section 174-A IPC shall be an abuse of the process of court. A similar view has been expressed by this Court in “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”.

13. In the present case the proceedings under the Negotiable Instruments Act have culminated in a settlement with the offence having been compounded.

14. In view of the above, the present petition is allowed and subject to a deposit of Rs.25,000/- as costs with the Spinal Rehab Centre, Chandigarh Plot No.1, Madhya Marg, Sector 28-A, Chandigarh, the FIR No.36 of 2018 dated 07.10.2018 registered under Section 174-A of IPC at Police Station BPTP, District Faridabad along with all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom are hereby quashed.

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

May 09, 2024
Vinay

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