



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

268/A

**CRM-M-47705-2024 (O&M)
Date of decision: 15.05.2025**

PUNEET MAHAJAN

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE HARPREET KAUR JEEWAN

Present : Mr. Namit Gautam, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Jaypreet Singh, DAG, Punjab.

Ms. Ishita Negi, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

HARPREET KAUR JEEWAN, J.

[1] The present petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of FIR No.117 dated 23.09.2021 under Sections 420, 120-B IPC along with Section 13 of Punjab Travel Professionals Regulation Act, 2014 registered at Police Station Division 2, Police Commissionerate, Jalandhar, on the basis of affidavit dated 23.05.2022 executed by respondent No.2 (Annexure P-2).

[2] Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the FIR was registered at the instance of respondent No.2 on account of a misconception between the parties. He further contends that the matter has been settled between the parties and affidavit dated 23.05.2022 has been executed by respondent No.2 (Annexure P-2). He submits that respondent No.2 does not want to take any



action in the FIR.

[3] Learned counsel for respondent No.2 confirms about the factum of compromise between the parties.

[4] On 24.09.2024 and 04.12.2024, the parties were directed to appear before the trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate for recording of their statements regarding the compromise.

[5] As per the report dated 21.04.2025 received from Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Jalandhar forwarded through the office of District and Sessions Judge, Jalandhar, statement of the parties and Investigating Officer have been recorded. There are total two accused namely Puneet Mahajan (present petitioner) and Naginder Khera, who are facing the trial. They have never been declared as proclaimed offenders and they are not involved in any other case. There is only one complainant namely Sugriv Parsad Tiwari. The complainant has no objection for acceptance of the compromise between the parties. The compromise effected between the parties is genuine, voluntary and without any coercion or undue influence.

[6] Learned State counsel has not raised any objection regarding the acceptance of the present petition.

[7] I have heard the aforesaid submissions and perused the paper-book.

[8] As per the allegations in the FIR, the petitioners-accused have taken money from the complainant and as per the compromise the said money has been returned. The dispute was *inter se* the parties and there is no litigation of forgery of documents. The parties want to remain in peace and end the litigation.

[9] Keeping in view the fact that the compromise between the parties is genuine and voluntarily made and in view of the ratio of the decision of Hon'ble



Apex Court in *Gian Singh Versus State of Punjab (SC) 2012 (4) RCR (Criminal) 543* and the decision of Hon'ble the Full Bench of this Court in *Kulwinder Singh and others vs. State of Punjab and others 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052*, the ends of justice would meet if the FIR and consequential proceedings are quashed by accepting the compromise between the parties.

[10] Consequently, this petition is allowed and FIR No.117 dated 23.09.2021 under Sections 420, 120-B IPC along with Section 13 of Punjab Travel Professionals Regulation Act, 2014 registered at Police Station Division 2, Police Commissionerate, Jalandhar and all the subsequent proceedings emanating therefrom are ordered to be quashed, qua the petitioner.

[11] However, the respondent No.2 and the State shall be at liberty to seek cancellation of this order, in case the final terms and conditions of compromise are violated.

[12] Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(HARPREET KAUR JEEWAN)
JUDGE

15.05.2025
P.Bhatt

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