

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

246

CRM-M-60133-2023

Date of Decision: December 20, 2023

Davinder Singh and another

.....Petitioner(s)

Vs.

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondent(s)

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR**

Present: Mr. Sandeep Arora, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Madhur Sharma, AAG, Punjab

Mr. G.S. Rawat, Advocate for respondent No.2.

----

**HARPREET SINGH BRAR J. (ORAL)**

1. This petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure seeking quashing of FIR No.274 Dated 23.12.2019 registered under Sections 406, 420 IPC and Section 13 of Punjab Travel Professionals Regulation Act, at Police Station Shahkot, District Jalandhar Rural, on the basis of compromise dated 15.04.2021 (Annexure P-4).

2. The FIR has been registered on the statement of complainant-Prem Lal-respondent No.2 on the ground that the accused-petitioners have duped the complainant to the sum of Rs.60,000/- on the pretext of sending him abroad. Now with the intervention of respectable persons, the matter has been amicably compromised between the parties and they have resolved their disputes and differences.

3. Keeping in view the fact that the parties have entered into a compromise, they were directed to appear before the trial court/Illaq Magistrate for getting their statements recorded in support of the

compromise. In pursuance of the direction, a report has been received from Judicial Magistrate First Class, Nakodar, stating that the compromise arrived at between the parties is without any pressure or coercion from any one and the same is genuine one.

4. Learned State counsel on instructions from the Investigating Officer and learned counsel for the complainant-respondent No.2 admit to the factum of compromise and submit that in case the parties have indeed settled their dispute, the State would have no objection to the quashing of the FIR, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record with their able assistance.

6. In a decision, based on compromise, none of the parties is a loser. Rather, a compromise not only brings peace and harmony between the parties to a dispute, but also restores tranquility in the society. After considering the nature of offences allegedly committed and the fact that both the parties have amicably settled their dispute, continuance of criminal prosecution would be an exercise in futility, as the chances of ultimate conviction are bleak. A two Judge Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Shakunta Sawhney (Mrs) Vs. Kaushalya (Mrs.) and others (1980) 1 SCC 63***, speaking through Justice V.R. Krishna Iyer, has held as under:-

*“4. ....The finest hour of justice arrives propitiously when parties, despite falling apart, bury the hatchet and weave a sense of fellowship or reunion.....”*

7. Consequently, keeping in view the fact that the dispute has been amicably settled and in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Narinder Singh and others vs. State of Punjab and another, (2014) 6 SCC 466*** and ***Ramgopal and another Vs. State of Madhya***

**Pradesh 2021 SCC OnLine SC 834** and Full Bench of this Court in **Kulwinder Singh Vs. State of Punjab 2007 (3) RCR (Crl.) 1052**, this petition is allowed and FIR No.274 Dated 23.12.2019 registered under Sections 406, 420 IPC and Section 13 of Punjab Travel Professionals Regulation Act, at Police Station Shahkot, District Jalandhar (Annexure P-1) and all subsequent proceedings arising out of the same are quashed qua petitioners.

**(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)**  
**JUDGE**

December 20, 2023  
sonia arora

|                            |        |
|----------------------------|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned: | Yes/No |
| Whether reportable:        | No     |