



CRM-M-31636-2019 and connected matter 1

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

280

CRM-M-31636-2019
Date of Decision: 17.02.2025

Usha Matta and others

.....Petitioner

Versus

M/s Hero Steels Limited

.....Respondent

CRM-M-33869-2019

Chhaya Raheja

.....Petitioner

Versus

M/s Hero Steels Limited

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Rishab Garg, Advocate, for
Mr. Aayush Gupta, Advocate, for the petitioner(s).

None for the respondent.

SANJAY VASHISTH , J. (ORAL)

1. The instant petitions have been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of Criminal Complaint No.COMA-2938-2018 dated 01.03.2018 under Section 138 of the Negotiable instruments Act (Annexure P-1) and the summoning order dated 13.09.2018 (Annexure P-2) passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Ludhiana, along with all consequential proceedings initiated on the basis of the complaint.

2. On 25.07.2019, the following order was passed (in CRM-M-31636-2019):

“Present petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of criminal complaint bearing No. COMA-2938 dated 01.03.2018 (Annexure P1) under Section 138 of the Negotiable

**CRM-M-31636-2019 and connected matter 2**

Instruments Act, 1881 and summoning order dated 13.09.2018 (Annexure P2), passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Ludhiana, whereby petitioners were ordered to be summoned to face trial along with other accused.

Learned counsel for the petitioners contended that filing of the complaint itself is misuse of the process of the Court because petitioners have never been Director or responsible persons of the company at any point of time nor they are signatory to the cheque and the learned trial Judge has not considered these aspects while passing the impugned order (Annexure P2).

Notice of motion for 29.10.2019.

Meanwhile, operation of the impugned order dated 13.09.2018 (Annexure P2) shall remain stayed qua the petitioners.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) submits that since the parties have settled their dispute amicably, he need not to press the present petitions, thus, prays for seeking withdrawal of the both petitions.

4. In view of the statement got recorded by the counsel representing the petitioner(s), both the petitions are dismissed as having been withdrawn.

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE**

**17.02.2025
anil**

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