

ITEM NO.17

COURT NO.13

SECTION II

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.) No(s).8164/2026

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 27-02-2026 in Application Under Section 528 BNSS No.8919/2026 passed by the High Court of Judicature at Allahabad]

M/S UP ANALAB

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF UP & ANR.

Respondent(s)

(IA No. 135566/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)

Date : 11-05-2026 This matter was called for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AHSANUDDIN AMANULLAH
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R. MAHADEVAN

For Petitioner(s) Ms. Mukta Gupta, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Tushar Gupta, Adv.
Ms. Nitya Gupta, Adv.
Ms. Vagisha Kochar, AoR
Mr. Rahul Gupta, Adv.

For Respondent(s) Mr. Sarvesh Singh Baghel, AoR

O R D E R

Heard Ms. Mukta Gupta, learned senior counsel appearing for the petitioner and learned counsel appearing for the respondent no.1-State of U.P.

2. The present petition has been filed against the impugned order dated 27.02.2026 passed by the High Court of Judicature at Allahabad in Application U/S 528 BNSS No.8919 of 2026 by which, the

High Court has not only refused to go into the merits with regard to quashing of the summoning order dated 04.11.2024 passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate, 1st Class, Rupnagar, Punjab against the petitioner in a case under Section 138 of the Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881 (for short, the "N.I. Act") but has also observed that the petitioner should appear before the Trial Court for compounding of offence through compromise and if not, the Trial Court would proceed in accordance with law and take all necessary steps and measures to procure his attendance as the law permits.

3. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner submitted that the High Court could not have exceeded its jurisdiction inasmuch as, go beyond the relief sought, which was for interfering with the summoning order dated 04.11.2024 and direct the matter to be compromised and if not, the Trial Court to take all coercive measures which, in fact, means that the Trial Court in more or less terms was required to take the petitioner, on appearance, into custody.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the respondent no.1-State of U.P. submits that it is a matter under the N.I. Act and the petitioner is liable to face the consequences of the cheque issued by him, not being honoured.

5. Having considered the matter, we are not persuaded to interfere in the matter. Accordingly, the Special Leave Petition stands dismissed. However, to the extent that the impugned order of the High Court has more or less in mandatory terms directed the matter to be compromised by the petitioner and if not, further direction to the Trial Court to resort to all necessary steps and

measures to procure his attendance, appears to be improper. Thus, the Trial Court shall proceed with the matter without being influenced or prejudiced by any of the observations made on any issue in the impugned order passed by the High Court, especially paragraph no.6 thereof.

6. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

**(SAPNA BISHT)
COURT MASTER (SH)**

**(ANJALI PANWAR)
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR**