



125

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

**CRM-M-53351-2022
DECIDED ON: 21.01.2026**

RAJEEV VAID**.....PETITIONER**

VERSUS

**BHUSHAN POWER AND STEEL LIMITED AND OTHERS
.....RESPONDENTS**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.

Present: Mr. Ivneet Singh Pabla, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Vinish Singla, Advocate, for respondent No.1.

Mr. Nitin Jain, Advocate, for respondent Nos.2 and 3.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J (ORAL)

1. On 17.11.2022, while issuing notice to the respondents, following order was passed:-

“Prayer in this petition is for quashing of the complaint No.NACT-413 of 2022 dated 11.01.2022 filed under Sections 138/141 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 and for setting-aside the order dated 07.05.2022 passed by the trial Court, vide which the petitioner has been summoned in the said complaint No.NACT-413 of 2022.

Counsel for the petitioner inter alia contended that the petitioner is not a signatory of the cheque, which was issued from the account of the firm and signed by Manoj Singla, a partner of the firm. It is further submitted that, in fact, much prior to issuance of the cheque, the petitioner has given a complaint to the police on 06.08.2021 (Annexure P-1) and when the police has not taken any action, the petitioner thereafter, filed a complaint before the Illaqa Magistrate, which is pending consideration. It is also submitted that when the legal notice was issued by the complainant on 08.09.2021, a reply was filed on

15.03.2022, highlighting the aforesaid fact that the petitioner is neither the signatory of the cheque nor he has any liability as there is a dispute between the petitioner and other persons.

Counsel for the petitioner has next argued that there are general allegations against the petitioner and the same do not meet the requirement of Section 141(1) of the Negotiable Instruments Act as it is not specifically stated that the petitioner is the Incharge of the day-to-day business of the firm.

Counsel for the petitioner has relied upon the judgment “S.M.S. Pharmaceuticals Limited vs Neeta Bhalla and another”, 2005(4) RCR (Criminal) 141 as well as the judgment “National Small Industries Corporation Limited vs Harmeet Singh Paintal and another”, 2010(2) RCR (Criminal) 122, wherein a similar view has been taken by the Hon’ble Supreme Court.

Notice of motion for 22.03.2023.

In the meantime, the proceedings qua the petitioner shall remain stayed.”

2. Today, on the very outset, counsel for the petitioner prays for withdrawal of the present petition, as parties have resolved the dispute amicably, by entering into compromise.

3. Keeping in view the statement made by counsel for the petitioner, present petition stands dismissed as withdrawn.

21.01.2026

Lavisha

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>