

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

CRM-M-27610 of 2023

Date of decision: 17th August, 2023

Amit Gupta

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. Sidhant Vermani, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Jashanpreet Singh, DAG, Punjab.
Ms. Nandini Sharma, Advocate for respondent No. 2.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (Oral):

1. This is a petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of FIR No. 160 dated 9.10.2016, under Section 63 of the Copy Right Act, Sections 102/104 of Trade Marks Act and Sections 415, 416, 417 and 420 IPC, registered at Police Station 'B' Division, Amritsar and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise.
2. As per the allegations in the FIR, the petitioner indulged in manufacturing and selling counterfeit products of the complainant-company.
3. On 30.5.2023, the parties were directed to appear before the Illaqa Magistrate/trial court for getting their statements recorded with regard to compromise.
4. The report dated 16.6.2023 is received stating that the compromise is genuine, voluntary, without any coercion or undue influence and that there is only one accused (petitioner herein) and he has not been declared as proclaimed offender.
5. Full Bench of this Court in *Kulwinder Singh and others vs. State of Punjab, 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052*, has held:-

“There is no statutory bar in Cr.P.C. which affects inherent power of this Court under Section 482. The power of quashing is not limited to matrimonial cases alone.”

6. The Supreme Court in *Parbatbhai Aahir @ Parbatbhai Bhimsinhbhai Karmur and others v. State of Gujarat and another, 2017 AIR (SC) 4843* laid down the broad principles governing the exercise of powers for quashing of FIR. It was held that the power under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is to be exercised by the High Court to secure the ends of justice, to prevent abuse of any process of law and in cases where in view of the compromise the possibility of conviction is remote and continuation of proceeding will cause oppression and prejudice.
7. The dispute has a pre-dominant tone and tenor of commercial transaction. The parties have settled the differences and decided not to litigate any further. No useful purpose would be served by continuing with the trial. To meet the ends of justice, the FIR mentioned above and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom are quashed.
9. The petition is allowed.

[AVNEESH JHINGAN]
JUDGE

17th August, 2023
mk

1. Whether speaking/ reasoned

:

Yes / No
2. Whether reportable

:

Yes / No