



\$~20 & 21

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ CRL.M.C. 1005/2021, CRL.M.A. 5122/2021 (stay)

HARPREET SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Bhuvneshwar Tyagi, Advocate.

versus

STATE & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Shoaib Haider, APP for the State.
Mr. Rishu Singh and Ms. Vasudha
Gupta, Advocates for R2.

21

+ CRL.M.C. 1006/2021, CRL.M.A. 5125/2021 (stay)

HARPREET SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Bhuvneshwar Tyagi, Advocate.

versus

STATE & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Shoaib Haider, APP for the State.
Mr. Rishu Singh and Ms. Vasudha
Gupta, Advocates for R2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA

ORDER

18.03.2025

%

1. Criminal Petitions under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (*hereinafter referred to as 'Cr.P.C.'*) have been filed on behalf of the Petitioner, Mr. Harpreet Singh to challenge the Order dated 18.02.2021 whereby the learned ASJ, Tis Hazari Court, Delhi has upheld the Order of Summoning of the Petitioner, in the Complaint Case No. 11942/2018.

2. It is submitted on behalf of the Petitioner that the Respondent/Complainant had also filed a Commercial Suit bearing CS (COMM) 3724/2021 based on the same cheques wherein the cheques have been held to have been issued by the Petitioner but it has been found that the Invoices in discharge of which the cheques had been issued, did not stand proven and there was also an observation of the goods not having been



delivered against the said Invoices. Commercial Court has already given a finding in respect of “legally enforceable debt”.

3. Learned counsel for the Respondent submits that the Appeal has already been filed against this Judgment.

4. Considering the totality of the circumstances, the Complaints are consigned *sine die* to be revived by either party on the decision of the Civil Appeals.

NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA, J

MARCH 18, 2025/RS