



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

157

CRM-M-27881-2026

Date of Decision: 18.05.2026

RAHUL DILIP SANKHALA**.....PETITIONER****VERSUS****STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER****...RESPONDENTS****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL**

Present: Mr. Sat Pal Singh Sidhu, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Vijay Kumar Panday, Advocate and
Mr. Shadab Ahmad, Advocate for the petitioner.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

1. This petition has been filed under Section 528 of BNSS (Section 482 Cr.P.C) for quashing of order dated 06.05.2026 passed by Id. ASJ Gurugram in CRR No. 235/2021 arising out of order dated 01.10.2021 passed by Id. JMIC, Gurugram in criminal complaint No. NACT/9386/2018 titled as M/s Capacite Engineering Pvt. Ltd. Vs Valecha Piletech Infra Pvt Ltd and Ors registered at the instance of respondent No.2 under Section 138 of Negotiable Instruments Act.

2. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner submits that in criminal complaint No. NACT/9386/2018, proceedings against accused Nos. 1 to 4 were initiated. He further submits that the applications filed on behalf of the petitioner seeking exemption from personal appearance were dismissed and non-bailable warrants were issued against the petitioner; however, the same



were returned unserved. He further submits that a criminal revision petition was filed by the petitioner challenging the maintainability of the complaint and the entire case was being handled by Mr. Umesh Valecha, who has been shown as the Managing Director. Learned Senior Counsel submits that Mr. Valecha kept informing the petitioner that everything was being handled properly and that the cases would be quashed. However, after about a week, when Mr. Umesh Valecha stopped answering the petitioner's calls, the petitioner requested one of his friends in Delhi as well as his acquaintance to look into the status of the cases being handled by Mr. Valecha on behalf of the company. The petitioner was shocked to know that his criminal revision petition had already been dismissed due to non-appearance of the counsel. He further submits that the petitioner is now ready and willing to join the proceedings before the trial Court and prays that the impugned order dated 06.05.2026 be set aside.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. Rakesh Kumar Jangra, AAG, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. This Court deems it appropriate to decide the petitioner without issuing notice to respondent No.2.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and gone through the case file.

6. In view of the limited prayer made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, this Court does not find any legitimate ground to interfere in the impugned order 06.05.2026 passed by Id. ASJ. However, in case the petitioner surrenders before the trial Court within a period of 07 days from today and



moves an application for grant of regular bail, the trial Court is directed to consider and decide the same on the same very day.

7. In the meantime, the non-bailable warrants shall not be executed, and this order shall not be operative after the lapse of seven days.
8. With these observations, the present petition stands disposed of.

18.05.2026
renu

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/ reasoned :
Whether Reportable :

Yes/No
Yes/No