RAJASTHAN HIGH COURT
सत्यमेव जयते

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous (Petition) No. 1548/2023

CNR: RJHC020204862023 | URN: CRLMP / 2792U / 2023

Puneet Mohnot S/o Shri Arjun Raj Mohnot, Aged About 44 Years, R/o B-59, Hari Marg, Malviya Nagar, Jaipur, Raj.

----Petitioner

Rajasthan High Court
सत्यमेव जयते
Web Copy - Not Official

Versus

1. State of Rajasthan, through Public Prosecutor.

----Respondent

2. Jagdish Kumar Khanchandani son of Shri Mangaram aged about 60 yeas, resident of Plot No.104, Himmat Nagar (East), Gopalpura Mode, Jaipur.

…….Complainant

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. S.K. Panwar, Advocate & Mr. Gaurav Kumawat, Advocate
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Gaurav Gupta, Public Prosecutor

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD KUMAR BHARWANI

Order

Date of which the judgment - was reserved	**23.09.2026**
Whether the full judgment or only the operative part was pronounced	**Full judgment**
Date of Pronouncement	**06.11.2026**

***

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner, a private person, Chartered Accountant (CA) by profession, for quashing of impugned FIR No.205/2022 registered at Police Station Pradhan Arakshi Kendra, Anti-Corruption Bureau, Jaipur (hereinafter referred to as the ACB), Charge-Sheet bearing No.395/2022 dt.04.11.2022 (submitted before the ld. ACB Court on 03.01.2023) as well as all consequential proceedings pending before the ld. ACB Court.

2. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that petitioner is a practicing CA, by profession, has been falsely dragged in the criminal case by the respondents by registering the impugned FIR

(Uploaded on 06/11/2026 at 02:28:34 PM)
(Downloaded on 10/11/2026 at 09:52:19 AM)

RAJASTHAN HIGH COURT सत्यमेव जयते

under Section 7A of Prevention of Corruption Act (Amended), 2018 (hereinafter referred to as PC Act for short) & Section 120-B IPC. In the FIR, the respondent No.2/Complainant alleged that the petitioner who was his CA, tow years prior to the impugned FIR, demanded a sum of five lakh rupees for settling an alleged case in the Income Tax Department (hereinafter referred to as the IT Department). In the complaint to the ACB, it was also stated by the Complainant/ respondent No.2 that he has no money dispute/amount outstanding or due to the accused/petitioner and there is no rivalry with the petitioner but he want to get him arrested, while taking the bribe.

Rajasthan High Court सत्यमेव जयते Web Copy - Not Official

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submitted that on the said complaint, the respondent ACB designed an illegal trap which was conducted on 24.5.2022 in which the petitioner was arrested while taking two lakh rupees from the complainant/respondent No.02. After arresting the petitioner, ACB registered the FIR on the next day i.e. on 25.05.2022 for the aforesaid Sections. After conducting the investigation, the ACB filed the charge-sheet, only against the petitioner, under Section 7A of the PC Act readwith Section 420 IPC. According to ld. counsel for the petitioner, the complete allegations as reported in the FIR and the conclusion as recorded in the charge-sheet are false, baseless & factually incorrect, and a classic case of misuse of provisions of PC Act as there had been no case of the complainant/ respondent No.2 at the IT Department from the very beginning of the complaint/case; hence, there had been no element for presence of public duty/work as alleged and, consequently, no presence of any public servant from the date of lodging of complaint or the case.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted the notable & specific facts of the present case from the documents, part thereof, are as under:-

(Uploaded on 06/11/2026 at 02:28:34 PM)
(Downloaded on 10/11/2026 at 09:52:19 AM)

RAJASTHAN HIGH COURT सत्यमेव जयते

i. It is not in dispute and also admitted by the complainant that the petitioner was not his CA from last two years.

ii. The petitioner during his association as professional CA with the complainant for FY 2016-17 to FY 2020-21 (two years prior to the FIR) raised seven GST paid bills of professional fee with total amount of Rs.2,46,030/- which are part of the petition (Annexure-5). Against the above bills, the complainant paid a sum of Rs.1,41,630/-, which are also part of the petition (Annexure-5); thereby keeping an amount of Rs.1,04,400/- as unpaid & outstanding, part of the petition (Annexure-5).

Apart from this, due to association of 4-5 years, on being requested by the complainant, the petitioner lent him a sum of Rs.1,00,000/- on 07.08.2019 on the assurance of return within two months.

The bank statements, 26AS/ Tax statement copies, professional fees bill copies, to support of the above facts, are part of the petition (Annexure-5).

This total amount of Rs.2,04,400 was outstanding towards the petitioner from the complainant and when the petitioner was taking the amount of Rs. Two lakh in full settlement of this outstanding amount from the complainant, he was arrested on account of the false allegation of bribe by the complainant/ respondent No.2.

iii. To get his outstanding money, the petitioner sent two emails to the complainant dt.02.02.2022 & 17.02.2022, sharing his bank details by mentioning in the emails **"our bank details for our fee remittance".**

Rajasthan High Court Web Copy - Not Official सत्यमेव जयते

(Uploaded on 06/11/2026 at 02:28:34 PM)
(Downloaded on 10/11/2026 at 09:52:19 AM)

RAJASTHAN HIGH COURT
सत्यमेव जयते

iv. The petitioner was not the CA of the Complainant at the time of complaint/FIR, therefore, he had no knowledge about pendency of any income tax case and further, he could not have any such information for the reason that the IT Department, under the circulars & notifications, issued by Ministry of Finance is required to share/provide information about any notice, case etc. only to the concerned person on his personal income tax log-in with a message of the same on his/her registered mobile number and/or registered email-id. In case, the complainant had any pending case, then, he would have received the information on his personal income tax login with a message on his registered mail id/ mobile number.

Rajasthan High Court
सत्यमेव जयते
Web Copy - Not Official

v. As some other person was the new CA of the complainant from last two years, therefore, he should have verified pendency of any case from his new CA, by sharing the information, if any, communicated to him by the IT Department at income tax login. There stands no logic of discussing the same not with current CA but with a CA, who have left two years back & the complainant is also having outstanding/due amount to him which is an indication for element of financial dispute between the complainant and the petitioner, though not disclosed rather concealed by him in the complaint.

vi. The complainant gave the false information to the ACB with allegation that the petitioner is demanding a sum of Rs. five lakh for getting the said case settled in the IT Department and then collecting Rs. two lakh as bribe in this matter, for

(Uploaded on 06/11/2026 at 02:28:34 PM)
(Downloaded on 10/11/2026 at 09:52:19 AM)

RAJASTHAN HIGH COURT सत्यमेव जयते

which the petitioner was arrested and then impugned FIR and charge sheet was filed.

vii. The petitioner was arrested on 24.05.2022 and he was enlarged on bail by the Hon'ble High Court by allowing SB Criminal Misc. Bail Application No.8721/2022 vide order dated 21.06.2022.

Rajasthan High Court सत्यमेव जयते Web Copy - Not Official

viii. After being released on bail, the petitioner approached the Office of the Director General, ACB & submitted the representation dt.08.12.2022, enclosing all information and documents pertaining to the previous Professional Association with the complainant and previous claim for the due amount with the support of previously raised bill. Without considering the representation duly received by the ACB, the charge-sheet dated 04.11.2022 was filed before the ld. ACB Court on 03.01.2023.

ix. For offence under Section 7A of the PC Act to be made out, there shall be presence of some Public Work/ Duty and Public Servant to perform that work/ duty. In the present case, the detailed charge-sheet itself disclosed that no public work/duty (no case was found pending/present in the IT Department) and, consequently, no presence of public servant was there in this case from the date lodging of the complaint/case. Therefore, offence under Section 7A of the PC Act is not made out.

x. In the charge-sheet, Section 420 IPC was added along-with Section 7A. Even offence under Section 420 IPC is also not made out for the reason that the petitioner was demanding his legitimate amount due against his outstanding amount and GST paid profession fee bills, which were raised much

(Uploaded on 06/11/2026 at 02:28:34 PM)
(Downloaded on 10/11/2026 at 09:52:19 AM)

prior to the illegal trap and registration of the FIR. It was further stressed & added that in case imaginary complaint would have been there, as alleged, then, in that case too, the complainant/ respondent No.2 would have taken services of & relied on words of his current CA and not the petitioner, who left the services two years back, with whom he was having financial dispute & not paying his outstanding dues.

xi. Petitioner, being a CA, maintained all his professional fee bills duly supported by the bank statement, 26AS copies of the TDS as deducted by the complainant and also duly showed in his financial statements. Therefore, when the petitioner was demanding & collecting his due professional fee and amount from the complainant, as mentioned above, even no offence under Section 420 IPC is made out.

5. In support of above, ld. counsel appearing for the petitioner further argued that the entire case is false and the offences under Section 7A of PC Act & Section 420 IPC are not made out. Learned counsel relied upon the judgment passed by the Coordinate Bench of this Court in the case of **Pramod Sharma Vs. State of Rajasthan & another,** decided on 07.04.2025, (SB Criminal Misc. Petition No.974/2025).

On the basis of the above submissions & the judgment, cited herein-above, ld. counsel for the petitioner prayed that the impugned FIR, resultant charge-sheet & the consequential proceedings pending before the ld. ACB Court No.1 be quashed & set aside.

6. In opposition of the above, learned Public Prosecutor for the State submitted that no illegality was committed by the ACB in arresting the petitioner while he was accepting the bribe amount of Rs. 2,00,000/- from the complainant on 24.05.2022 for which the FIR was

(Uploaded on 06/11/2026 at 02:28:34 PM)
(Downloaded on 10/11/2026 at 09:52:19 AM)

registered and after detailed investigation, charge-sheet was filed against him as allegations were found to be proved. Therefore, no case is made out for interference while exercising power under Section 482 Cr.P.C. in the present case involving serious allegations of corruption against the petitioner.

Rajasthan High Court Web Copy - Not Official

7. Heard learned counsel appearing for the parties at length and perused the documents as well as the judgments cited.

8. It is noted from the order-sheets of the case that the notice was issued and served to the complainant/respondent No.2 in the year 2023 and even after service, no one has put appearance on his behalf and no reply has been filed to oppose the facts of the present petition. Even after more than three years of notice being served to the complainant/respondent No.2, he is unrepresented, even after effective service.

9. From the arguments as raised, this Court noted that in the present case, initially the FIR was registered by the ACB for offence under Section 7A of the PC Act readwith Section 120-B IPC. However after investigation, the ACB noted that as no public servant/person and public duty/work, as alleged by the complainant in the FIR, was found to be present in the case and also no case was found in the IT Department, therefore, the charge-sheet was filed against the petitioner only, a single and private person, for offence under Section 7A of the PC Act read with Section 420 IPC. Before proceeding further, it is relevant to quote Section 7A of the PC Act, which reads as under:-

> *"7A. Taking undue advantage to influence public servant by corrupt or illegal means or by exercise of personal influence.*
>
> *Whoever accepts or obtains or attempts to obtain from another person for himself or for any other person any undue advantage as a motive or reward to induce a public servant, by corrupt or illegal means or by exercise of his personal influence to perform or to cause performance of a public duty improperly or dishonestly or to forbear or to cause to forbear such public duty by such public servant or by another public*

(Uploaded on 06/11/2026 at 02:28:34 PM)
(Downloaded on 10/11/2026 at 09:52:19 AM)

> *servant, shall be punishable with imprisonment for a term which shall not be less than three years but which may extend to seven years and shall also be liable to fine."*

10. Perusal of Section 7A of the PC Act shows that to make out the allegations under the Section, there must be presence of a Public Duty/ Work and to do the same, there shall be some Public Servant. It is only when there is some Public Work/Duty; a person can demand money to get the work done with or without the assistance of public servant. Admittedly, as noted from the record of the file and also from the specific fact, as recorded in the detailed charge-sheet by the ACB, no case, was found pending in the IT Department at the time of lodging of complaint and further no public servant of the IT Department was found associated with the petitioner so as to prove the allegations of the complainant, on the basis of which the trap was conducted on 24.05.2022 in which petitioner was arrested and the FIR was registered on 25.05.2022.

11. In regard to the applicability of Section 7A of the PC Act in the present case, this Court considered the judgment as passed in the case of **Bharat Lal Saini & Another Vs. State of Rajasthan & Another,** in SB Criminal Misc. Petition No.8406/2022, decided on 04.08.2023. In the said case, the FIR was registered under Section 7 & 7A of the PC Act read-with Section 120-B IPC. The relevant para of the judgment reads as under:-

> *"6. Thus, it is evident that to attract the mischief of Section 7 of the Act, the act of demand etc. must have connection with the discharge of public duty by the public servant. If the public servant has not been assigned with the public duty as claimed by the complainant, the offence under Section 7 of the Act would not be attracted. Likewise to attract the offence under Section 7A, there must be allegation of exercise of personal influence for performance/ forbearance in improper and dishonest manner of public duty by some other public servant.*
>
> *The expression "public duty" implies that the public servant must be enjoined with the responsibility/duty to discharge in the matter alleged by the prosecutor.*

(Uploaded on 06/11/2026 at 02:28:34 PM)
(Downloaded on 10/11/2026 at 09:52:19 AM)

Rajasthan High Court Web Copy - Not Official

7. It is evident from the record that above-referred plot s recorded in Zamabadni/ Khewat/ Khatoni as an agricultural land, vide Annexure-2. An inquiry was conducted by the Department after institution of the FIR just to initiate disciplinary proceedings against the petitioner and in that inquiry report, it is mentioned that the said plot is outside the municipal area. Respondent no. 2 also made an assertion that the plot is outside the municipality area. It is further mentioned that no colony has been developed on the said land rather, farming was going on the said land, a report is available at Annexure-3. Section 90A of the Rajasthan Land Revenue Act, 1956 provides that an agricultural land cannot be used for non-agricultural purposes unless permission of the State Government is obtained beforehand. The said provision details how the application along with requisite fee for the said conversion would be submitted and only the Collector of the District is competent to grant such permission on behalf of the State Government. Respondent No. 2 has not produced any material on record nor the Investigating Officer has collected such evidence that respondent NO. 2 had already taken/obtained permission of the Collector for such conversion. Therefore, respondent No. 2 was himself indulged in an illegal act of conversion of an agricultural land into a residential land without permission of the competent authority. Since the petitioner was in no way competent or authorised to grant such permission, it cannot be said that the act alleged against the petitioner is in the garb of discharge of his public duty. Moreover, admittedly the land was beyond the municipal area, hence, respondent No. 2 was conscious of the fact that municipality had no role in the matter of such conversion which has statutorily been empowered to some other authority. It is not the prosecution case that the petitioner was demanding money for getting the work performed by any other public servant. Explanation 1 to Section 7 is explicit that acceptance of undue advantage would be sufficient to constitute an offence even if the public duty was performed properly. However, when there is no public duty assigned to perform or not to perform, nor there was case of any pendency of any work of the complainant with the petitioner of the nature alleged in the FIR or otherwise, the criminal prosecution of the petitioner would amount to abuse of the process of law. Section 7A of the P.C. Act is attracted in quite different facts and circumstances of the case and not in the present case. There is no material that the petitioner did what is alleged to getfavour of any other public servant to improperly or dishonestly discharge his public duty.

8. Thus, it is an evident fact that the petitioner was not a public servant enjoined with a public duty to perform anything in the matter as is asserted in the FIR. Therefore, unless the demand, etc. has some reasonable nexus to the dishonest and improper performance of the public duty by the public servant himself or by any other public servant, the offences under section 7 or 7A of the P.C. Act are not made out.

(Uploaded on 06/11/2026 at 02:28:34 PM)
(Downloaded on 10/11/2026 at 09:52:19 AM)

Once the substantive offence is not made out, the allegation of conspiracy to commit that offence does not stand, therefore, this Court holds that the ingredients of offence alleged in the FIR are not made out against the petitioner. As such, the criminal prosecution of the petitioner would be abuse of the process of law.

9. Mr. Gupta has relied upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Rajiv Thapar Vs. Madan Lal Kapoor (2013)3 SCC 330 wherein earlier judgments were noticed and following guidelines were laid down for exercise of jurisdiction under Section 482 Cr.P.C.:-

> *"Based on the factors canvassed in the foregoing paragraphs, we would delineate the following steps to determine the veracity of a prayer for quashing, raised by an accused by invoking the power vested in the High Court under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure:*
>
> ***(i)*** *Step one, whether the material relied upon by the accused is sound, reasonable, and indubitable, i.e., the material is of sterling and impeccable quality?*
>
> ***(ii)*** *Step two, whether the material relied upon by the accused, would rule out the assertions contained in the charges leveled against the accused, i.e., the material is sufficient to reject and overrule the factual assertions contained in the complaint, i.e., the material is such, as would persuade a reasonable person to dismiss and condemn the factual basis of the accusations as false.*
>
> ***(iii)*** *Step three, whether the material relied upon by the accused, has not been refuted by the prosecution/complainant; and/or the material is such, that It cannot be justifiably refuted by the prosecution/complainant?*
>
> ***(iv)*** *Step four, whether proceeding with the trial would result in an abuse of process of the Court, and would not serve the ends of justice?*
>
> *If the answer to all the steps is in the affirmative, judicial conscience of the High Court should persuade to quash such criminal proceedings, in exercise of power vested in it under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Such exercise of power, besides doing justice to the accused, would save precious court time, which would otherwise be wasted in holding such a trial (as well as, proceedings arising therefrom)specially when, it is clear that the same would no conclude in the conviction of the accused."*

In the aforesaid case, after considering the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Rajeev Thapar Vs. Madan Lal Kapoor,** reported in 2013 (3) SCC 330, the Coordinate Bench of this

(Uploaded on 06/11/2026 at 02:28:34 PM)
(Downloaded on 10/11/2026 at 09:52:19 AM)

Court quashed the FIR and criminal proceedings initiated by ACB for offence under Section 7 & 7A of the PC Act.

11. The judgment, as relied upon by the learned counsel for the petitioner, was passed in the case of Pramod Sharma **(supra)** in which the FIR was registered against the petitioner for offence under Section 7A of the PC Act. The Court, after discussing the provisions of the Section 7A of the PC Act, quashed the impugned FIR, qua the petitioner, a private person. The relevant para of the judgment reads as under:-

> "9. The language of the Section 7A of the P.C. Act of 2018 clearly speaks that even a person who is not a public servant can also be made an accused for an offence punishable under Section 7A if there are allegations based on evidence of accepting or obtaining or adopting to obtain from any other person for himself or for any other person any undue advantage as a motive or reward to induce a public servant, by corrupt or illegal means or by exercise of his personal influence to perform or to cause performance of a public duty improperly or dishonestly or to forbear or to cause to forbear such public duty by such public servant or by another public servant.
>
> 10. In order to establish the offence under Section 7A of the P.C, Act of 2018, it must be proved that (I) the accused accepted or obtained or admitted to obtain from someone; (II) for himself or for any other person; (III) any undue advantage as a motive or reward and ; (IV)ot induce a public servant; (V) by corrupt or illegal means or by exercise of his personal influence to perform or o cause performance of a public duty improperly or dishonestly.
>
> In the present case, initially the allegation against the petitioner was of demanding and accepting the money from the complainant for getting some favour from the DIG Police, Bharatpur-Lakshman Gaur. The police after completion of the investigation, has submitted closure report as regards the Lakshman Gaur, the then D.I.G. Police, Bharatpur. Now the only accused remains in this case is the present petitioner who is not a public servant.
>
> On bare reading of the provision of section 7A of the P.C. Act of 2018, the basic ingredient is the involvement of a public servant who can be induced by a private person after receiving some illegal reward from the complainant to get some work done.
>
> 11. Since, no public servant is involved in the present case, the provision of Section 7 A of the P.C. Act of 2018 cannot be directed and thus the prosecution of the accused-petitioner alone who is not a public servant is not sustainable and the entire criminal proceedings against the petitioner is vitiated in law.
>
> 12. …….

(Uploaded on 06/11/2026 at 02:28:34 PM)
(Downloaded on 10/11/2026 at 09:52:19 AM)

Rajasthan High Court Web Copy - Not Official

13. In view of the conclusion given in the closure report, as stated above, it is very much clear that no any public servant has been found to be involved in this criminal case. In view of the specific provision of Section 7A of the P.C. Act of 2018, no private person can be made as an accused for the offence punishable under Section 7A of the P.C. Act of 2018 without there being involvement or making a public servant as a co-accused. Hence, in the opinion of this Court only prosecuting a private person (not a public servant) without there being any other public servant a co-accused is not mandate of Section 7A of the P.C. Act of 2018 and the prosecution of such private man alone is not sustainable.

14. ……

15. ……..

16. ……

17. In the case of Amara Krishna Rao (supra), the High Court of Andhra Pradesh at Hyderabad has observed as under:-

"In fact, the question of prosecuting a non-public servant for any offence covered by the P.C. Act arises if there is any possibility of ascertaining basing upon the evidence to be recorded as to whether the public servant involved in connivance with the non-public servant being the concerned Commercial Tax Officer in committing the alleged offences along with the non-public servants. It all depends upon whether the prosecution can be allowed to record evidence against him with reference to the charge under the P.C. Act. 'Abatement' means an extinguishment of the very right of action itself or to cease, terminate or come to an end prematurely and consequently the right of the prosecution to prosecute a deceased accused in a criminal case is effectually wiped out. Unless the public servant is held to be guilty of the charge punishable under the P.C. Act on the basis of the evidence which can be recorded, there will not be any possibility to uphold the same charge against the non-public servants. Therefore, when in view of the abatement of the charge against the public servant the question of reopening it against him does not arise at all, the question of considering that charge against the non-public servants also does no arise at all."

18. Having considered the totality of the facts of this case and more particularly the fact that apart from the present petitioner, who is a private person, no any public servant has been found to be involved in this case and so also the view taken by the various Courts as noted above, this Court is of the opinion that the criminal proceeding initiated against the petitioner are vitiated in law and therefore, deem just and proper to exercise the inherent jurisdiction of this Court vested under Section 528 of the B.N.S.S.

19. Accordingly, this criminal miscellaneous petition is allowed. The criminal proceedings qua the petitioner pending before the Court of learned Special Judge

(Uploaded on 06/11/2026 at 02:28:34 PM)
(Downloaded on 10/11/2026 at 09:52:19 AM)

(Prevention of Corruption cases) No. 4, Jaipur in the form of Criminal case No. 12/2020 for the offence punishable under Section 7A of the P.C. Act, 2018 arising out of F.I.R. no. 99/2020 registered at Police Station Pradhan Aarakshi Kendra, A.C.B. Jaipur, District jaipur alongwith the charge sheet No. 127/2020 and so also the order of cognizance dated 04.09.2020 passed by the Court of learned Special Judge Sessions Court Prevention of Corruption Act No. 1 Jaipur (Raj.) are quashed and set aside with all consequential proceedings."

Rajasthan High Court Web Copy - Not Official

12. Considering the above cited two judgments, in the backdrop of the facts of the present case, this court noted that where the petitioner is a private person, practicing professional CA, against whom provisions of Section 7A of the PC Act have been misused in disregard of the fact that after the detailed charge-sheet, the ACB failed to find presence of any public work/duty of the complainant in the IT Department from the date of lodging of the complaint and also presence of any public servant in the case, though falsely alleged by the complainant.

In the judgments, as passed by the Coordinate Bench of this Court in the cases of Bharat Lal Saini & Pramod Sharma **(supra)**, where the Court examined the issue of applicability of Section 7A, where the ingredients of the offence were missing, the Court quashed the FIR and all criminal proceedings. In the present case, when, there is no presence of public work/duty and, consequently, no presence of any public servant, in the light of above two judgments, this Court, hereby, has reached to the definite conclusion that offence under Section 7A of the PC Act is not made out against the petitioner, a private person and sole accused, in the case.

13. This Court further noted that initially, Section 120-B IPC was added in the FIR along-with Section 7A of the PC Act, however, after failing to find presence of any public work/duty and, consequently, no presence of public servant, then Section 420 IPC was added by ACB in the charge-sheet. To examine the allegation regarding Section 420 IPC,

(Uploaded on 06/11/2026 at 02:28:34 PM)
(Downloaded on 10/11/2026 at 09:52:19 AM)

Rajasthan High Court Web Copy - Not Official

this Court, while considering the arguments of ld. counsel for the petitioner, also documents as discussed above, noted that the petitioner was demanding his legitimate due amount from the complainant against outstanding amount and GST paid professional fee bills as noted above. This Court further considered from the documents placed on record, which are total seven bills of Professional Fee, GST paid, along-with the bank statement, 26AS documents, which shows that the petitioner even paid GST on those bills of professional fee at the relevant time, for which required credit was also taken by the complainant in his books of account/ GST return. Further, the complainant/respondent No.2 have accepted & recognized the above noted bills of the petitioner, which gets verified from the entries as reflected in 26AS/tax statement of the petitioner. The date of the noted financial documents, which are part of Government records, therefore, cannot be doubted for any reason whatsoever. Therefore, the bills, as raised by the petitioner, have not been disputed by ld. P.P. and also could not have been opposed by the complainant as well, who choose not to appear even after proper service.

14. Based on the above discussion, this Court has no hesitation to record that intentionally correct facts were not informed to the ACB in the complaint, rather intentionally concealing the facts the complaint was registered on the basis of which ACB designed the illegal trap in the present case. This Court further, while perusing the record, noted that the petitioner has placed on record his two e-mails dt.02.02.2022 & 17.02.2022, which were sent to the complainant much prior to the ACB trap dt.24.05.2022, whereby the petitioner forwarded his bank details for remittance of due professional fee amount.

15. Despite having above serious facts, based on the documents, as placed on record of this case and also submitted to ACB

(Uploaded on 06/11/2026 at 02:28:34 PM)
(Downloaded on 10/11/2026 at 09:52:19 AM)

by the petitioner, which has not been disputed by ld. P.P. also, were not considered by the ACB in investigation and it filed the charge-sheet, despite noticing that Section 7A was not made out in view of the above discussed reasons. Therefore, without considering the reasons, which on the face of record shows that when the petitioner was demanding his own legitimate due amount against total seven GST paid professional fee bills, then no offence of cheating can be said to be made out in the above-noted facts & circumstances of the case.

16. In the light of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **State of Haryana & Ors. Vs. Bhajan Lal & Ors.,** reported in AIR 1992 SC 604, where the principles were laid down for exercise of power under Section 482 Cr.PC for quashing of the criminal proceedings, the detailed facts of the case as noted and facts further discussed in the light of the judgments, as cited by the ld. counsel for the petitioner and after noticing the questionable absence of the complainant to support his complaint or counter the plea of the petitioner, this Court finds that the impugned FIR bearing No.205/2022 and the charge-sheet bearing No.395/2022 as filed under Section 7A of the PC Act readwith Section 420 IPC, are abuse of process of law and no offences are made out against the petitioner.

17. In view of the above, this Court deems it fit & appropriate to exercise its inherent jurisdiction under Section 482 Cr.PC. Consequently, the present petition is **allowed.** The impugned FIR bearing No.205/2022, the charge-sheet No.395/2022 and all the consequential proceedings are, hereby, quashed & set aside.

18. Pending applications (if any) also stands disposed of.

(VINOD KUMAR BHARWANI),J.

ASHOK

(Uploaded on 06/11/2026 at 02:28:34 PM)
(Downloaded on 10/11/2026 at 09:52:19 AM)