



\$~24

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **CRL.M.C. 1125/2024**

ANURADHA SHUKLA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Yogesh Sharma, Ms. Pratima
Rani, Mr. Yugant Parihar and Mr.
Yogeshwar Singh, Advs.

versus

**ORAVEL STAYS PVT. LTD. (THROUGH ITS
DIRECTOR/AUTHORIZED SIGNATORY)**

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Akshay Mehra, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA

ORDER

11.07.2024

%

1. Petition under Section 482 CrPC filed seeking quashing of the impugned order dated 11.03.2019 *vide* which petitioner was summoned in a case under Section 138 NI Act.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner had been Director of the erstwhile accused Company, who had resigned even prior to the date of issue of the cheques. The only apparent error was that the record of the Registrar of Companies have not been updated which was the duty of the continuing Directors for which she cannot be penalized. She came to know about this order of summoning only on 09.10.2023 as is also evident from the Order Sheets of the learned Trial Court. There has been illegality committed for which reason the impugned order of summoning has been challenged.



3. The first remedy for the basic condition for which the impugned order of summoning has been challenged is by way of filing revision petition before the learned Sessions Court.
4. The petition is dismissed with liberty to the petitioner to approach the learned Additional Sessions Judge against the impugned order.

NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA, J

JULY 11, 2024/ns