

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

273

2026:PHHC:071611



CRM-M-7373-2026 (O&M).
Date of decision: 06.05.2026.

MANDEEP SINGH

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

...Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present :- None for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Onkar Singh Wahla, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

None for the respondent.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

Prayer in the present petition under Section 528 of the Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 is for quashing of case bearing FIR No.418
dated 23.10.2025 under Section(s) 406, 420 and 120-B of the Indian Penal
Code, 1860 and Section 24 of the Emigration Act, 1983, registered at Police
Station Chandimandir, District Panchkula, Haryana, along with all subsequent
proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 29.01.2026
(Annexure P-2).

2 The aforesaid FIR was registered on the statement of complainant Manpreet Singh which reads as under: -

“I wanted to go abroad on a work visa and while searching for a good agent, I received a phone call from Mandeep Singh 9065500003, who told his name as Mandeep Singh and said that one of my acquaintances gave my number and said that he is an agent and sends people abroad, and my acquaintance told that I also wanted to go abroad. I said yes, I also want to go to New Zealand on a work permit/work visa. Thereupon the accused Mandeep Singh Dhindsa called me to meet and asked for my address, so I told him my village address, and in June 2023, the accused came to meet me, reached my village, called me and came to our sitting place to meet. The accused told that his name was Mandeep Singh Dhindsa and that he had a company named GIG Consultant, which sent people abroad on work permits, tourist visas and study visas. I told the accused Mandeep Singh Dhindsa that I wanted to go to New Zealand on a work visa, but I wanted all the work to be done properly and in a completely legal manner. The agent Mandeep Singh Dhindsa told that all their work was proper and completely legal and they sent people abroad legally, and to make me believe he showed some documents and photos on his phone and said that they also had a government license to send people abroad and all their work was proper and completely legal, and I believed him. When I asked the accused Mandeep Singh about the legal fee/expenses for sending me to New Zealand, he told me that my total expenses would be Rs.30 lakhs. And when I asked how the payments were to be made, the accused told me that he would tell me how to make the payments. The accused asked me for my passport, PAN card, Aadhaar card and copies of the passport, so I immediately went to the market and got photocopies of all my documents made and gave them to the accused Mandeep Singh. The accused told me to give him Rs.2 lakhs so that he could get my file prepared,

and the remaining payment he would tell me how and when to pay once my file was ready. I told the accused Mandeep Singh that I did not have money, but I would give him the money after few days and I told him to start my work and I would give him Rs.2 lakhs. The accused Mandeep Singh told me to arrange the money and call him, saying that he would personally come and take the money from me. That I arranged some money and called the accused that the money had been arranged, then the accused came to our house and took 3 lakhs from me in my presence and left, saying that my work would be done soon and my visa would come. That one day the accused Mandeep Singh called me on my WhatsApp number and told me that my file had been prepared and some of my signatures were required on the documents. I was to go to his office which is in Chandigarh so that my work visa process could be completed. The accused Mandeep Singh called me to his office and got some documents signed from me and told me to give him another Rs.4 lakhs. I asked for time to arrange the money and then I took Rs.4 lakhs from my commission agent and gave it to the accused Mandeep Singh. The accused Mandeep Singh again called me and told me that my visa had come, that I must prepare to go. That thereafter the accused Mandeep Singh called me and told me that my offer appointment letter had come from the company in New Zealand where I was to work. The accused asked me for Rs.3 lakhs and told me that my work was almost done. I told the accused Mandeep Singh to give me his bank account number and I would deposit the money in his account. The accused gave me his account number; I deposited Rs.2 lakhs in the accused's account and deposited Rs.1 lakh on the accused's Google Pay number. The accused Mandeep Singh, to gain my trust, showed me an offer appointment letter and said that my job had also been arranged and as soon as I went there I would get the job. To make me believe, the accused sent me dummy ticket and airline seat screenshots and said that they would send me abroad. That thereafter, after the time given by

the accused, when I called the accused asking when my ticket would be arranged, the accused started avoiding me and said that there was some strictness being exercised, and thereafter the accused reduced answering my calls. Then one day the accused told me that my work would not be done and he would return my money. The accused returned Rs.1 lakh to me through my bank account and gave me some cheques of the remaining amount, saying that he would deposit the rest in my account. When the accused did not return my money and stopped answering my calls, I presented the cheques given by the accused in the bank, but they were dishonoured. Thereafter, me and my uncle also went several times to the accused's office, but till date the accused is avoiding. I request you that a case be registered against the accused Mandeep Singh, for cheating me of ₹9 lakhs by showing fake documents in the name of sending me abroad, strict legal action be taken.”

3 However, with the intervention of the respectables, the parties have decided to compromise the matter. Hence, the present petition.

4 The parties were directed to appear before the learned trial Court/Illaq Magistrate vide order dated 09.02.2026 of this Court, to get their statements recorded regarding the compromise arrived at between the parties and a report in this regard was called for.

5 Pursuant to the said order, a report has been received from the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Panchkula, vide Endst. No.488 dated 18.04.2026.

The relevant extract of the report is reproduced as under: -

“5. In light of the on oath statements of the parties and the report submitted by Investigating Officer of the case, the detailed report is hereby submitted as under :-

(1) As per the report submitted by Investigating Officer of the case, there is only accused, namely, Mandeep Singh.

(2) There is only one complainant/victim(s) namely, Manpreet in the present case.

(3) Accused Mandeep Singh and complainant Manpreet appeared in the trial Court and made statements.

(4) No affected person was left out in the quashing petition filed in the Hon'ble High Court.

(5) As per the report submitted by Investigating Officer of the case, no accused has been declared a proclaimed offender/proclaimed person no such proceedings against him have been initiated or pending adjudication.

(6) The compromise entered into between the complainant and accused person is genuine, voluntary and without any coercion or undue influence.

(7) As per ICJS portal, following FIRs were registered against the accused:-

(i) FIR No.430 dated 31.10.2025, under Sections 406, 420, 120B IPC & 24 of Emigration Act, PS Chandimandir, Panchkula

(ii) FIR No.440 dated 06.11.2025, under Sections 406, 420, 120B IPC & 24 of Emigration Act, PS Chandimandir, Panchkula

(iii) FIR No.415 dated 07.11.2025, under Sections 318(4), 336(2), 337, 338, 336(3), 340(2), 61(2) BNS, PS City Firozpur, Punjab.”

6 Learned State counsel does not dispute the factum of the compromise amongst the parties and does not have any serious objection to the resolution of the dispute amongst the parties.

7 The broad principles for exercising the powers under Section 482, Cr.P.C (now Section 528 BNSS) were summarized by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of 'Parbatbhai Aahir @ Parbatbhai Bhimsinhbhai Karmur and others versus State of Gujarat and another' (2017) 9 SCC 641'. The relevant paragraphs are extracted as under: -

16.1. Section 482 preserves the inherent powers of the High Court to prevent an abuse of the process of any court or to secure the ends of justice. The provision does not confer new powers. It only recognises and preserves powers which inhere in the High Court.

16.2. The invocation of the jurisdiction of the High Court to quash a first information report or a criminal proceeding on the ground that a settlement has been arrived at between the offender and the victim is not the same as the invocation of jurisdiction for the purpose of compounding an offence. While compounding an offence, the power of the court is governed by the provisions of Section 320 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973. The power to quash under Section 482 is attracted even if the offence is non-compoundable.

16.3. In forming an opinion whether a criminal proceeding or complaint should be quashed in exercise of its jurisdiction under Section 482, the High Court must evaluate whether the ends of justice would justify the exercise of the inherent power.

16.4. While the inherent power of the High Court has a wide

ambit and plenitude it has to be exercised (i) to secure the ends of justice, or (ii) to prevent an abuse of the process of any court.

16.5. The decision as to whether a complaint or first information report should be quashed on the ground that the offender and victim have settled the dispute, revolves ultimately on the facts and circumstances of each case and no exhaustive elaboration of principles can be formulated.

16.6. In the exercise of the power under Section 482 and while dealing with a plea that the dispute has been settled, the High Court must have due regard to the nature and gravity of the offence. Heinous and serious offences involving mental depravity or offences such as murder, rape and dacoity cannot appropriately be quashed though the victim or the family of the victim have settled the dispute. Such offences are, truly speaking, not private in nature but have a serious impact upon society. The decision to continue with the trial in such cases is founded on the overriding element of public interest in punishing persons for serious offences.

16.7. As distinguished from serious offences, there may be criminal cases which have an overwhelming or predominant element of a civil dispute. They stand on a distinct footing insofar as the exercise of the inherent power to quash is concerned.

16.8. Criminal cases involving offences which arise from commercial, financial, mercantile, partnership or similar transactions with an essentially civil flavour may in appropriate situations fall for quashing where parties have settled the dispute.

16.9. In such a case, the High Court may quash the criminal proceeding if in view of the compromise between the disputants, the possibility of a conviction is remote and the continuation of a

criminal proceeding would cause oppression and prejudice; and

16.10. There is yet an exception to the principle set out in propositions 16.8. and 16.9. above. Economic offences involving the financial and economic well-being of the State have implications which lie beyond the domain of a mere dispute between private disputants. The High Court would be justified in declining to quash where the offender is involved in an activity akin to a financial or economic fraud or misdemeanour. The consequences of the act complained of upon the financial or economic system will weigh in the balance.”

8 The following relevant factors emerge from perusal of the case as well as the subsequent developments supplementing a case for invocation of the powers under Section 528 BNSS:-

- (i) It is established from the report of the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Panchkula, that a compromise has been effected voluntarily between the parties restoring peace and harmony between them.
- (ii) The petitioner is aged 34 years and continuation of criminal proceedings would have a serious adverse impact on his future prospects, employment opportunities and social standing.
- (iii) The occurrence does not reflect any deep-rooted criminal intent or continuing threat to society.
- (iv) The offences alleged, though not to be condoned, cannot be categorised as heinous or of such a nature that they shock the conscience of society or warrant continuation of prosecution despite settlement.

(v) In view of the compromise, the complainant is unlikely to support the case of the prosecution, thereby rendering the possibility of conviction remote.

(vi) Continuation of the criminal proceedings in such circumstances would not serve any larger public interest and would result in unnecessary harassment to the parties.

(vii) The ends of justice would be better served by putting an end to the proceedings rather than allowing them to continue as an exercise in futility, leading to wastage of precious judicial time.

(viii) costs stand paid.

9 In view of the report of the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Panchkula, and having regard to the settled principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court on the subject, the instant petition is allowed. FIR No.418 dated 23.10.2025 under Section(s) 406, 420 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Section 24 of the Emigration Act, 1983, registered at Police Station Chandimandir, District Panchkula, Haryana, along with all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, is hereby quashed on the basis of compromise dated 29.01.2026 (Annexure P-2) entered between the parties.

10 Petition is allowed in above terms.

May 06, 2026.
raj arora

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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