



CRM-M-16128-2026

1

171

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

**CRM-M-16128-2026
Date of decision: 25.03.2026**

Lakhvinder Singh

...Petitioner

Vs.

HDFC Bank Ltd.

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present: Ms. Kesar Arora, Advocate for
Ms. Nidhi Sharma, 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 24.09.2019 (Annexure P-10) passed by learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Karnal in complaint bearing No.NACT-2941/2017 and CNR No.HRKR030218042017 dated 05.09.2017 filed under Section 138 of Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881, vide which, petitioner has been declared as proclaimed person and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner was declared as proclaimed person and subsequent FIR was registered on account of non-appearance of the petitioner before the learned trial Court, which was not intentional. Further, the complaint before the trial Court has been dismissed as withdrawn by the complainant-bank vide order dated



CRM-M-16128-2026

09.07.2021 (Annexure P-12). Learned counsel requested that impugned order, vide which, the petitioner was declared as proclaimed person, in the interest of justice.

3. Given the nature of order this Court proposes to pass, no notice is required to be issued to the respondent.

4. Heard.

5. Keeping in view the fact that complaint before the trial Court has been dismissed as withdrawn, continuation of the proceedings arising from the impugned order would be an abuse to the process of law. Hence, present petition is allowed and the order dated 24.09.2019 (Annexure P-10) and consequential proceedings arising therefrom are hereby quashed subject to payment of cost of Rs.15,000/- to be deposited with Indian Red Cross Society having Account No.3578152035, Central Bank of India, Sector 17-B, Chandigarh, IFSC CBIN0280412.

6. Petitioner is directed to place on record the copy of receipt of cost on the file within a period of one month. It is made clear that if the petitioner fails to place on record the copy of receipt, this order shall be deemed to be dismissed.

March 25, 2026
Himani

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

(i)	Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
(ii)	Whether reportable	Yes/No