



**In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
at Chandigarh**

125

CRM-M-17219-2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 16.04.2026

Inderjeet Kathuriya

... Petitioner

Versus

Satyavan and another

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present:- Mr. Pradeep Chhoker, Advocate for the petitioner.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 528 of BNSS for quashing of impugned order dated 20.02.2026 (Annexure P-2) passed by learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Handi, in a case bearing CIS No.NACT-27 of 2024 dated 29.01.2024 titled 'Satyawan Vs. Inderjeet' registered under Section 138 of Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881, vide which, petitioner has been declared as proclaimed person and all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that vide impugned order dated 20.02.2026 (Annexure P-2) petitioner was declared as proclaimed person on account of his non-appearance before the learned trial Court, which was not intentional. Further, compromise has been effected between the parties and the petitioner has paid the entire amount to the complainant/respondent No.1. Moreover, complaint before the trial Court has been dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 26.02.2026 (Annexure P-4).



Learned counsel requested that impugned order, vide which, the petitioner was declared as proclaimed person as well as the subsequent proceedings be quashed, in the interest of justice.

3. Mr. Baljeet Nain, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of respondent No.1 and has filed memorandum of appearance, which is taken on record. He has also admitted the factum of aforesaid compromise.

4. Learned State counsel also submitted that he has no objection if the impugned order be quashed.

5. Heard.

6. The inherent jurisdiction under Section 528 BNSS, 2023/Section 482 Cr.P.C., 1973 is primarily aimed at preventing abuse of judicial process and securing the ends of justice. Thus, when the dispute is essentially personal in nature and a genuine compromise has been reached, the High Court may intervene to quash the criminal proceedings, recognizing the continuation thereof would be non-productive and unjust in the given circumstances.

7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the present case, without going into the controversy as to whether the petitioner was aware of the proceedings going against him under the Negotiable Instrument Act or not; the fact remains that the petitioner had been declared as proclaimed person in the complaint referred to above vide order dated 20.02.2026 (Annexure P-2), and the complaint has already been dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 26.02.2026 (Annexure P-4), meaning thereby, with the dismissal of the complaint the impugned order passed during the course of proceedings of the complaint had already stood culminated; therefore,



CRM-M-17219-2026 (O&M) (3)

keeping the consequent proceedings alive after the dismissal of the complaint would not serve any purpose but would be an abuse of process of law; Ergo the impugned order as well as consequential proceedings are hereby set aside.

8. The petition is allowed accordingly.

16.04.2026
Geeta

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking /reasoned	Yes / No
Whether Reportable	Yes / No