

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-56907-2023
DECIDED ON: 24.01.2024

SURYA NARAYAN SINGH
.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA
.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Nafees Ahmad Khan, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Pawan Kumar Jhanda, DAG Haryana.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

1. This is a petition under Section 482 of Cr.P.C., for quashing the FIR No.495 dated 13.09.2023 (Annexure P-1) registered at Police Station Faridabad, Kotwali, District Faridabad under Section 174-A of IPC.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner states that the main complaint under Section 138 of Negotiable Instruments Act involving cheque No.086590 dated 30.11.2017 for a sum of Rs.25,574/- drawn on Syndicate Bank stands withdrawn by the complainant, in view of the compromise affected between the parties vide order dated 12.09.2023 (Annexure P-3).
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has placed reliance upon the orders dated 20.07.2022 and 24.08.2022 respectively, passed by a coordinate Bench of this Court in CRM-M-46062-2017, titled as *“Jatin Dhawan and another versus State of Haryana and another”* and CRMM-12534-2022, titled as *“Krishan Kumar versus State of Haryana and another”*, respectively wherein it has been held that once the main case is dismissed as withdrawn, the continuation of proceedings under Section 174-A IPC shall be an abuse of process of law.

4. He has also placed reliance upon the orders of this Court dated 12.12.2022 and 13.12.2022 passed in CRM-M-55634-2022 titled as “**Jinder Singh Vs. State of Punjab and another**” and CRM-M-45051-2022 titled as “**Hari Singh Meena Vs. State of Haryana**”, respectively in this regard.

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 regularised by the court while granting bail to the petitioner, the default stood condoned. In such circumstances, continuation of proceedings under Section 174-A I.P.C. Shall be abuse of the process of court.

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. 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 of the IPC shall be an abuse of the process of court.

7. Since the main complaint has been dismissed as withdraw, as is evident from the perusal of aforesaid order passed by Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Faridabad and the offence between the petitioner and complainant is personal in nature not against the society at large, who have resolved their dispute, no fruitful

purpose would be served by continuing the proceedings in the instant FIR No.495 dated 13.09.2023 (Annexure P-1) registered at Police Station Faridabad, Kotwali, District Faridabad under Section 174-A of IPC.

8. Keeping in view the above-said facts and circumstances, the present petition is allowed and FIR No.495 dated 13.09.2023 (Annexure P-1) registered at Police Station Kotwali, District Faridabad under Section 174-A of IPC, with all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, are hereby quashed qua the petitioner.

24.01.2024

Meenu

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>