



CRM-M-20770-2024 (O&M)

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

236

CRM-M-20770-2024 (O&M)

Date of decision : 08.04.2026

Dr. Baljeet Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.. Respondents

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

Present:- Mr. Randeep S. Dhull, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Vijay Kumar, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Ravinder Hooda, Advocate for respondent No.2.

H.S. Grewal, J.(Oral)

1. This petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for quashing of the complaint case titled 'Ravinder versus Secure Multi Services etc.' (Annexure P-1) bearing NACT/660/2022 dated 16.07.2022 pending in the Ld. Court of JMIC, Sonipat under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act (for short, 'NI Act') and further for setting aside the summoning order dated 08.08.2022 (Annexure P-5) whereby the petitioner has been summoned to face trial in the aforesaid case and for setting aside all other consequential proceedings arising therefrom.

2. The case of the prosecution is that respondent No.2 filed a complaint (Annexure P-1) under Section 138 of NI Act against respondent No.3-Secure Multi Services as well as the petitioner and respondent No.4-Dinesh Kumar. It is pleaded that the accused, in order to discharge liability,

**CRM-M-20770-2024 (O&M)****-2-**

had issued a cheque bearing No.153377, dated 15.03.2022, amounting to Rs.42,60,000/-, drawn on Union Bank of India, Karnal in favour of the complainant/respondent No.2, however, the same had been dishonoured with the remarks 'Payment stopped by drawer'.

3. Vide order dated 26.04.2024, learned counsel for the petitioner prayed for time to place on record Form No.32 relating to the Company.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he has already furnished an affidavit on 04.05.2024 stating that despite best efforts to find out Form No.32 of Companies Act pertaining to Secure Multi Services, the same was not traced even deponent/petitioner tried to search on various sites on the Google, but nothing is traced out.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the present complaint (Annexure P-1) and summoning order (Annexure P-5) are liable to be set aside as the petitioner was never the signatory nor the Director nor was associated in any capacity with Secure Multi Services and he is not liable to pay any liability.

6. *Per contra*, learned counsel for respondent No.2 has disputed the aforesaid submissions of learned counsel for the petitioner.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record.

8. It is apparent that the complaint under Section 138 of the NI Act is pending adjudication before the learned trial Court. The plea taken by learned counsel for the petitioner is that the petitioner was neither a Director nor signatory to the cheque in question and was not associated with respondent No.3-Company in any capacity. However, such a plea involves disputed



CRM-M-20770-2024 (O&M)

-3-

questions of fact, which require appreciation of evidence and cannot be adjudicated upon in a petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C.

9. Consequently, no ground is made out to interfere with the complaint or the summoning order in exercise of inherent jurisdiction of this Court and the petition is hereby dismissed.

10. However, the petitioner shall be at liberty to raise all permissible pleas before the trial Court at the appropriate stage.

11. Pending application(s) shall stand disposed of accordingly.

08.04.2026
Sonia

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

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