

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

**CRM-M-29746-2020 (O&M)**

**Date of Decision: 27.10.2020**

Rinku Bhatia @ Avtar Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab & another

... Respondents

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.**

Present:- Mr. R.P. Dhir, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. A.S. Sandhu, Additional Advocate General, Punjab.

....

**TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA, J. (ORAL).**

Matter has been taken up through Video Conferencing via Webex facility in the light of the Pandemic Covid-19 situation and as per instructions.

Instant petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. seeking quashing of FIR No.73, dated 20.04.2018, under Section 420 IPC, registered at Police Station Model Town, District Hoishiarpur on the basis of a compromise dated 22.04.2019 (Annexure P-3) which as per counsel was entered into with respondent.

Counsel for the parties have been heard at length.

Suffice it to observe that FIR had been registered on the allegations that the accused (petitioner herein) while acting as a travel agent has duped the complainant party of a sum of Rs.1,60,000/-.

On the previous date of hearing, learned State counsel had been requested to complete instructions as to whether during the course of investigation, petitioner has been found to be a travel agent.

Mr. A.S. Sandhu, learned Additional Advocate General, Punjab upon instructions from ASI Harnek Singh informs the Court that apart from the present FIR, petitioner is involved in six other cases and he has been found to be working as a travel agent.

This Court cannot proceed oblivious of the fact that these days such matters of innocent people being duped of their hard earned money by travel agents on the pretext of selling a foreign dream, are on the rise. These are matters which need a thorough probe.

Learned State counsel in the present case apprises the Court that challan has been filed and even charges have been framed.

In the light of the above, this Court does not find it to be a fit case to intervene and to quash the FIR on the basis of a compromise that may have been entered into by the petitioner with respondent No.2.

Petition is dismissed.

It is, however, clarified that this Court has not examined the case on merits and it would be open for the petitioner to raise all pleas in defence as may be available to him in accordance with law.

**27.10.2020**

*harjeet*

**(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)  
JUDGE**

- |     |                            |        |
|-----|----------------------------|--------|
| i)  | Whether speaking/reasoned? | Yes/No |
| ii) | Whether reportable?        | Yes/No |