

**In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
At Chandigarh**

CRM-M-4181-2022 (O&M)
Date of Decision:-13.9.2022

Daljit Rai Jassal

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Rajiv Joshi, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sarabjit Singh Cheema, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Prateek Rathee, Advocate for respondents No.2 and 3.

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has approached this Court seeking grant of anticipatory bail in respect of a case registered vide FIR No.0090, dated 22.7.2021, Police Station Bhogpur, Jalandhar, under Sections 406, 420 of Indian Penal Code and Section 13 of Punjab Travel Professionals (Regulation) Act.
2. At the time of issuance of notice of motion, the following order was passed on 2.2.2022:

“Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that although this is a second petition on behalf of the petitioners seeking grant of anticipatory bail, but there has been a substantial change in circumstances inasmuch as the parties have now amicably resolved their issues and have entered into a compromise i.e. compromise

deed dated 24.11.2021 (Annexure P-3) and that the complainant would not have any objection for grant of anticipatory bail.

Notice of motion for 12.5.2022.

At this stage, Mr. Prateek Rathee, Advocate, puts in appearance on behalf of the complainant and has expressed that he has no objection for grant of interim bail to the petitioner.

Meanwhile, in the event of arrest, the petitioner be released on interim bail subject to his furnishing personal bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting/Investigating Officer. However, the petitioner shall join the investigation as and when called upon to do so and cooperate with the Arresting/Investigating Officer and shall abide by the conditions as provided under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that pursuant to a compromise having been effected amongst the parties, a separate petition for quashing of FIR on the basis of compromise i.e. CRM-M-23174 of 2022 has been filed in this Court, wherein notice of motion had been issued and parties had been directed to appear before the Trial Court/Illaq Magistrate so as to get their statements recorded qua the factum of compromise.
4. Learned State counsel has, however, feigned ignorance about the factum of compromise. Learned State counsel has informed that the petitioner has since joined investigation.
5. Learned counsel representing the complainant has endorsed the factum of compromise.
6. Having regard to the aforestated position, wherein the petitioner is stated to have joined investigation and that the matter has been amicably resolved amongst the parties and a petition for quashing of FIR on grounds of compromise has also been filed, the petition is accepted and the interim

directions issued by this Court vide order dated 2.2.2022 are hereby made absolute, subject to the condition that the petitioner shall join investigation as and when called upon to do so and cooperate with the Investigating Officer and shall also abide by the conditions as provided under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

13.9.2022

pankaj

**(Gurvinder Singh Gill)
Judge**

Whether speaking /reasoned

Yes / No

Whether Reportable

Yes / No