



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

202

CRM-M-9558-2025(O&M)
Date of Decision: 10.07.2025

Gurdeep Singh alias Deepi

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU

Present: Mr. Atul Jain, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Jaiveer Singh, Advocate for
Mr. P.S. Ahluwalia, Advocate for the *de facto*-complainant.

MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU, J.

Present petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') for grant of pre-
arrest bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 11 dated 17.01.2025, under
Section 318 (4) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short
'BNS'), registered at Police Station Sadar Patiala, District Patiala.

2. Allegations are that petitioner along with co-accused
manipulated the weight of the husk with intention to cause wrongful
loss to complainant and defrauded him to the tune of Rs. 15 lakh by
doing so.



3. Contends that petitioner was granted interim protection by this Court on 19.02.2025 and now, compromise has been effected between the parties i.e. petitioner as well as complainant.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has shown ignorance about the compromise entered into between the parties i.e. petitioner as well as *de facto*-complainant; although, he opposed the prayer on the premise that allegations against petitioner are serious in nature.

5. Learned counsel for complainant has duly acknowledged the factum of compromise entered into between the parties i.e. petitioner as well as *de facto*-complainant.

6. Heard learned counsel for parties and perused the paper-book.

7. It transpires that petitioner was granted interim protection by this Court on 19.02.2025 and the order reads as under:-

“Contends, inter alia, that petitioner is inclined for an amicable settlement with de facto complainant.

Notice of motion.

At this stage, Mr. Kunwarbir Singh, learned AAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State; whereas, Mr. P.S. Ahluwalia, Advocate, causes representation and files Power of Attorney on behalf of the complainant.

Learned counsel for the complainant, on instructions, submits that he is not averse to the contention raised on behalf of the petitioner.

In view of the stand taken by both sides, petitioner as well as complainant shall appear



before the Mediator, Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court on 11.03.2025.

Report be awaited for 09.04.2025.

In order to facilitate the mediation proceedings, arrest of the petitioner shall remain stayed.”

8. Concededly, the matter has been amicably settled between the parties i.e. petitioner as well as *de facto*-complainant in view of the report dated 08.04.2025 of the Mediator, Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court. The relevant para No. 7 of report reads as under:-

i. That the first party has agreed to pay a sum of Rs.4,75,000/- (Rupees Four Lakhs and seventy Five Thousand only) as settlement amount to the second party.

ii. That both the parties has agreed to appear before the Investigating Officer, Police Station Patiala on 14.04.2025 whereby the first party will present a demand draft/cash of Rs.4,75,000/- (Rupees Four Lakhs and seventy five Thousand only) to the second party in lieu of the settlement that the second party agrees not to pursue the present criminal proceedings against the first party.

iii. That as and when quashing petition of the present FIR qua the first party is instituted before the Court of Law, the second party undertakes to suffer a statement as required by the Court of Law.”

9. In view of the above; but without going into legality and validity of the compromise entered into between parties, there is no justification to deny the concession of pre-arrest bail to petitioner. Consequently, present petition is allowed. Petitioner shall join investigation before Investigating Officer subject to the conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) BNSS.



10. It is also made clear that petitioner shall fully co-operate with the Investigating Officer as and when called for further investigation.
11. The above observations be not construed as an expression of opinion on merits of the case; rather confined only to decide the bail matter.
12. It is also clarified that in case of any recurrence on the part of petitioner, State would be at liberty to move an appropriate application for recalling of this order.

Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

10.07.2025
Harish Kumar

(MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No