



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

**CRM-M No.16760 of 2023**  
Date of decision: 21<sup>st</sup> May, 2024

Jagdeep Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab & another

... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL**

Present: Mr. Naveen Bawa, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Shiva Khurmi, Asst. Advocate General, Punjab  
for the respondent/State.

Mr. Sachin Ohri, Advocate for respondent No.2.

**MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)**

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing FIR No.0002 dated 11.01.2021 (Annexure P-1) under Sections 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of the IPC registered at Police Station Division 1, District Pathankot along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 13.02.2023 (Annexure P-2) effected between the parties.

2. Vide order dated 20.04.2023 of this Court, the parties were directed to appear before the learned trial Court/Illaq Magistrate to get their statements recorded regarding the compromise arrived at, between them.



3. Report has since been received from learned Addl. Chief Judicial Magistrate, Pathankot, in pursuance of the direction of this Court, wherein, it stands reflected that in compliance of order dated 20.04.2023, the petitioner and the complainant i.e. Bajaj Finance Company have indeed arrived at an amicable settlement and the same is without any pressure or coercion and out of their free will and the complainant has also made statement to the effect that they would have no objection if the FIR qua the accused-petitioner is quashed.

4. The trial Court has annexed a copy of the statements of the parties, alongwith its report.

5. Learned counsel for respondent No.2/Company has made a categorical statement in the Court today that the petitioner has repaid the loan, which was obtained from the complainant/Company and there are no outstanding dues; he thus, does not oppose the prayer made by the learned counsel for the petitioner for quashing the FIR in question qua the present petitioner.

6. Learned State counsel has brought to the notice of this Court that other than the petitioner, there are three other accused who too had been named in the FIR in question by the complainant.

7. Learned counsel for the complainant has, however, categorically stated that the three remaining accused had not repaid the loan obtained from the complainant/Company and hence, no settlement had been affected between them.



8. On a pointed query, learned counsel for the respondent/complainant has apprised the Court that all four persons, who obtained loan including the present petitioner, were unconnected with each other, however, a common FIR had been lodged against all the for defaulters/accused.

9. In the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, as well as keeping in view of the report of the learned Addl. Chief Judicial Magistrate, Pathankot and the principles laid down by the Apex Court in ‘**Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab and others**’ (2012) **10 SCC 303**, and also by the Full Bench of this Court in ‘**Kulwinder Singh and others v. State of Punjab and another**’ 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052, the instant petition is allowed. The aforesaid FIR and all consequential proceedings arising out of it qua the petitioner, are quashed.

10. Needless to say, the parties shall remain bound by the terms of compromise and their statements recorded before the Court below.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)  
JUDGE

May 21, 2024  
rps

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