



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

123

**CRM-11774-2025 in/and
CRM-M-8994-2024
Date of decision: 03.04.2025**

Sanjeev Kumar

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. Nirmaljeet Singh Sidhu, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. H.S. Deol, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)**CRM-11774-2025**

Prayer in the instant application is for advancing the date of hearing of main case from 08.10.2025 to some early date.

Heard.

In view of the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is allowed and the date of hearing of the main case is advanced from 08.10.2025 to today itself.

CRM-M-8994-2024

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. for quashing of FIR No.143 dated 23.12.2022 under Section 174A of the IPC registered at Police Station Phul, District Bathinda, along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been declared a proclaimed person, in Complaint bearing



**CRM-11774-2025 in/and
CRM-M-8994-2024**

-2-

COMA No.351/2019 titled as 'The Bathinda Central Co-op Bank Ltd., Mehraj, Tehsil Phul, District Bathinda Vs. Sanjeev Kumar', filed under Section 138 read with Section 142 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 (for short, 'the NI Act'), vide order dated 17.12.2022, pursuant to which FIR in question under Section 174A of the IPC has been registered against him. Learned counsel has vehemently contended that as soon as the petitioner learnt about the pendency of the complaint in question, he immediately made the payment of the cheque amount to the complainant and compromised the matter with him. Resultantly, the complaint instituted under Section 138 of the NI Act by the complainant, was withdrawn by him on 03.01.2024. In support, he has drawn the attention of this Court to Annexure P-3 wherein the said fact stands reflected. A prayer therefore, has been made that in the aforementioned facts and circumstances, no purpose would be served by prosecuting the petitioner under Section 174A IPC.

3. Learned State counsel has opposed the prayer made by the counsel opposite and contended that it was evident that the petitioner had intentionally not appeared during the proceedings under Section 138 of the NI Act before the learned Trial Court and hence, the prayer of the petitioner deserved to be declined.

4. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material on record.

5. The petitioner was declared a proclaimed person in a complaint case under Section 138 of the NI Act which stands dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 03.01.2024 after the parties arrived at a



CRM-11774-2025 in/and
CRM-M-8994-2024

-3-

compromise. Hence, continuation of criminal proceedings under Section 174A IPC would serve no useful purpose.

6. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the FIR in question registered under Section 174-A IPC, along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, is quashed.

03.04.2025

Vinay

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

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