



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

204

CRM-M-24103-2018

Date of decision: 09.07.2025

Raja Motors

...Petitioner

Versus

Ajaib Singh

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL

Present: Mr. Rajan Bansal, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Ms. Monika Jalota, Advocate (Legal aid counsel)
For the respondent.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of the Criminal Complaint under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 bearing case No. COMA-7479 dated 03.05.2016 pending in the Court of Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Bathinda.

2. The case of the petitioner is that he is running a firm by the name of Raja Motors from where complainant-respondent had purchased a scooter for which invoices or Form 21 and 22 have been placed on record as Annexure A-1. It is stated by the complainant that there was a scheme running by the petitioner-firm that if respondent-complainant will purchase a scooter of the earlier year model i.e. 1997 then Company would give him cash back of Rs.25,000/- and the complainant-respondent believed the policy of petitioner-firm and purchased the abovesaid scooter. He further submits that the petitioner-firm had given him a cheque of Rs.25,000/- from the account of one Okara Agro Industries Limited duly signed by Narinderjit Singh authorized signatory, to be drawn in the name of Ajaib Singh son of Sunder Singh.



3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that petitioner -Raja Motors has been falsely implicated in the complaint since the cheque has been issued by Okara Agro Industries Limited and there was no such scheme of cash back policy of Rs.25,000/- which has been claimed by the complainant-respondent. The complainant-respondent had concocted a story and made the petitioner a party instead of Okara Agro Industries Limited. It is quite evident that cheque has been issued by Okara Agro Industries Limited and the name of the Raja Motors does not figure out anywhere. Even in the complaint, the complainant states that he was to receive a cheque of Rs.25,000/- as cash back but this fact is also refuted by the counsel for the petitioner. Learned counsel for the petitioner has clarified that no such scheme is launched in writing or published any where and exhibited any where and this story is false and concocted.

4. Learned counsel for the respondent has opposed the contention made hereinabove.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the paper book carefully.

6. Be that as it may, the cheque has been signed by an authorized signatory of Okara Agro Industries Limited and in case any liability is made out, the same would be borne by Okara Agro Industries, therefore, the present petition is allowed and complaint is quashed qua the present petitioner Raja Motors.

7. Ordered accordingly.

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

09.07.2025

anil

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