



\$~22 & 23

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ CRL.M.C. 1513/2023 & CRL.M.A. 5753/2023, CRL.M.A.
28276/2023
NAVEEN CHAUDHARYPetitioner
Through: Mr. Rohit Gupta, Adv.

versus

OM PRAKASH CHANDANA & ORS.Respondents
Through: Mr. Hemraj Singh, Adv.

23

+ CRL.M.C. 1558/2023 & CRL.M.A. 5930/2023, CRL.M.A.
26896/2023
NAVEEN CHAUDHARYPetitioner
Through: Mr. Rohit Gupta, Adv.

versus

OM PRAKASH CHANDANA & ORS.Respondents
Through: Mr. Hemraj Singh, Adv.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ KUMAR OHRI
ORDER
% **25.07.2024**

1. By way of the present petitions the petitioner seeks quashing of the proceedings pending before the learned Trial Court vide criminal complaint no. 7746/2018 and 8682/2018. As the parties are same and the learned counsel for parties have addressed common submissions, the petitions are taken up together and disposed of vide this common order.
2. Learned counsel for petitioner has submitted two-fold submissions. Firstly, it is contended that the respondent/complainant is guilty of carrying



out the material alterations in the cheque inasmuch as the year has been changed from 2014 to 2017. It is stated that the petitioner has also taken recourse by filing a complaint under Section 156(3) Cr.P.C. in which an FIR has been registered and FSL report has been received opining alteration in the year mentioned on the cheque.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner further contends that the petitioner has also made part payments and as such respondents ought not to have presented cheque for complete payment and thus there existed no debts or legal liability.

4. The petitions are resisted by the learned counsel for complainant by denying the contentions raised by the learned counsel for petitioner.

5. The respondent further denies carrying out any alteration in the said cheques and the receipt of the sum under the cheque.

6. Considering that rival stands have been taken by both the parties involving disputed questions of facts, the same needs to be contested before the learned Trial Court. Contentions of the parties are left open for consideration before the Trial Court.

7. At this stage, learned counsel for petitioner prays that the petitioner be exempted.

8. Needless to state that any exemption, if any, be filed before the learned Trial Court be considered on its own merits.

9. The petitions stand disposed of.

MANOJ KUMAR OHRI, J

JULY 25, 2024/ns