

261

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

2026.PHHC.021227



Date of decision: 11.02.2026.

(1)

CRM-M-45294-2023 (O&M)

SAHEB RISHEB

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER

...Respondent(s)

(2)

CRM-M-48545-2019 (O&M)

ANITA SEKHRI

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER

...Respondent(s)

(3)

CRM-M-48606-2019 (O&M)

ANITA SEKHRI

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER

...Respondent(s)

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

Present :- Ms. Ishima Randhawa, Advocate, and
Ms. Akshita Tandon, Advocate,
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Saurav Verma, Addl. A.G. Punjab.

Mr. Deepak Girotra, Advocate,
for respondent No.2.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The above-mentioned three petitions seeking quashing of the FIRs along with all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, are being decided by this common order, as they pertain between the same parties and emanate from the same dispute. The petitioner Saheb Risheb in CRM-M-45294-2023 is the son of Anita Sekhri, petitioner in CRM-M-48454-2019 and CRM-M-48606-2019.

2 The details of the cases are tabulated as under: -

Sr. No.	CRM-M-No.	Title	HEAD NOTE/PRAYER
1	CRM-M-45294 of 2023	Saheb Risheb Vs State of Punjab and another	Petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C for quashing the FIR No. 387 dated 18.08.2016 (Annexure P-1) under sections 448, 511, 34 of IPC 1860 registered at Police Station Civil Lines, Amritsar City, District Amritsar; And Challan/Final Report dated 30.12.2017 (Annexure P-13) in the FIR and all consequential therefrom. proceedings arising Any other order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit in the facts and circumstances of the present case.
2	CRM-M-48545 of 2019	Anita Sekhri Vs State of Punjab and another	a. FIR No. 618 dated 11.10.2016 registered under Sections 420, 120-B IPC at P.S. Civil Lines,

			District Police Commissionerate, Amritsar (Annexure P-1) and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom; b. Challan/Final Report in terms of Section 173 Cr.P.C. dated 20.2.2018 filed in FIR No. 618 dated 11.10.2016 under Section 173 Cr.P.C. (Annexure P-20) qua the petitioner C. Order dated 28.5.2018 (Annexure P-25) passed by the Learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Amritsar, whereby, cognizance was taken qua the Challan in FIR No. 618; d. Order dated 3.5.2019 (Annexure P-27) passed by the Learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Amritsar in case FIR No. 618 whereby, the application filed by the petitioner under Section 294 Cr.P.C. for admission or denial of the genuineness of the documents before proceeding further with the trial was rejected; e. Order dated 1.10.2019 (Annexure P-29) passed by the Learned Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar dismissing the Revision Petition filed by the Petitioner against the said Orders dated 3.5.2019 passed by the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Amritsar.
3	CRM-M-48606 of 2019	Anita Sekhri Vs State of Punjab and another	a. FIR No. 387 dated 18.8.2016 registered under Sections 448, 511, 34 IPC at P.S. Civil Lines, District Police Commissionerate, Amritsar (Annexure P-1) and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom; b. Challan/Final Report in terms of Section 173 Cr.P.C. dated

			31.12.2017 filed in FIR No. 387 dated 18.8.2016 (Annexure P-19) qua the petitioner; C. Order dated 28.5.2018 (Annexure P-24) passed by the Learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Amritsar, whereby, cognizance was taken qua the Challan in FIR No. 387; d. Order dated 3.5.2019 (Annexure P-26) passed by the Learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Amritsar in case FIR No. 387, whereby, the application filed by the petitioner under Section 294 Cr.P.C. for admission or denial of the genuineness of the documents before proceeding further with the trial was rejected; e. Order dated 1.10.2019 (Annexure P-28) passed by the Learned Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar dismissing the Revision Petition filed by the Petitioner against the said Orders dated 3.5.2019 passed by the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Amritsar
--	--	--	---

3 Both the FIRs i.e. FIR No.618 dated 11.10.2016, as well as FIR No.387 dated 18.08.2016, have been got registered on the statement of Dhani Ram-respondent No.2. FIR No.618 dated 11.10.2016, registered under Sections 420, 120-B IPC at Police Station Civil Lines, District Police Commissionerate, Amritsar, is reproduced as under:-

“Subject: Fraud of Rs. 11 lakhs by Prof Anita Sekhri Deptt of Economics DAV College, Amritsar. Esteemed Sir, I am to submit as under:-1. Prof Anita Sekhri has been working as a

lecturer in Economics at DAV College, Amritsar and residing at 25 B;Guru Amardas Avenue Ajnala Road Amritsar with mobile. No. 981 5285186. 2. The undersigned has served DAV College, Amritsar as Lecturer in Eco, From 1967-1991 and after that served as principal DAV College Batala (1991-1997), K.R.M DAV college Nakodar, Distt. Jalandhar (1997-2000) and DAV college Amritsar (2004-05) and 2005-06 and retired thereafter. 3. Prof. Anita Sekhri had been my student as well as colleague at DAV College Amritsar. 4. Being a teacher and principal I was given to understand that her married life had been a disturbed one. 5. It was in the month of January 2012 when the undersigned had been working in Lovely Professional University, Phagwara that Prof. Anita Sekhri demanded an amount of Rs. 8 lakhs as a loan because her husband had deserted her and had filed several cases in the court of law at Amritsar against his wife namely case regarding the bouncing of cheques with very heavy amount and claiming his right on the property at 25-B Guru Amardas avenue Ajnala Road, Amritsar. 6. When I expressed my helplessness in giving such a big amount of loan she had offered me to purchase one plot measuring 152.88 sq. Yards Guntala Sub Urban Abadi Colony Tehsil Amritsar-2 at the road of Jujhar Singh Avenue, Amritsar Plot was purchased by paying an amount of Rs. 11 lakhs and the registry was done in my name. 7. It was in the month of July 2015 that Prof. Anita Sekhri, informed that she might loss the case of ownership of property in the court therefore, she desired to transfer her property 25-B Guru Armadas Avenue Ajnala Road Amritsar in my name otherwise her family including mother and son shall be homeless. 8. In September 2015 her kith was transferred in my name in the District Court, Amritsar. 9. In November 2015, Prof. Anita Sekhri informed that Punjab Govt. has imposed property tax on buildings as well as on plots. 10. Since I have been working at Vedic Mohan Ashram, a Guest house of DAV at Haridwar from

2012 I had spent original registry to her at Amritsar so that required property tax could be paid. 11. After about six months, I started demanding my original registry but she agreed to return the same after her property at 25-B Guru Amar Dass Avenue, Ajnala Road, Amritsar was transferred from my name to her name. 12. On 26-02-16 I went to Amritsar & the property was transferred, in her name in the presence of Mr. Pankaj Kumar, college attendant/peon who acted as a witness. 13. Since March, 2016 I had been pressing hard to return my registry but my several phones as well as messages were never responded deliberately. 14. On March 2016 Mr. Pankaj Kumar from his mobile No. 94640-21787 informed me at Haridwar that Mr. Saheb Kumar son of Prof Anita Sekhri has handed over one packet to him for making a speed post at my address at Haridwar. 15. As per his statement speed post was forwarded on 26-03-2016 as 25-03-2016 it was a holiday in post office due to Good Friday. The same speed post has not been received till this date. 16. Then I had sent photocopy of registry to a senior teacher at DAV College Amritsar to know about the status of my registry. 17. On his enquiry it has been confirmed that Prof. Anita Sekhri had got the registry of my plot transferred on 12-07-2015 in her name by getting my signature on folded papers as settled with the vasika nawis. 18. Since 12-07-2015, she had been lying and did not reveal that she has cheated and robbed me of Rs.11 lakhs by using fraudulent method of getting my registry transferred in her name. 19. Sir, it is clear case of 420 and fraud by Prof. Anita Sekhri against her teacher as well as principal. I request you to kindly probe an enquiry into the, whole episode and set. the wrong right. I am sure that you kindly help me in the matter and grant me justice. She should either surrender Rs.11 lakhs or get the registry transferred back in my name.”

registered at P.S. Civil Lines, District Police Commissionerate, Amritsar, was registered by ASI Ashok Kumar on the statement of complainant-respondent No.2 Dhani Ram. The same is reproduced as under:-

“Today I ASI along with HC Pargat Singh 1756, HC Dalip Singh 2610 were on patrolling for searching for the bad elements and as such a Naka was laid down near Navalti Chowk. A mobile call from No. 7500183555 was received at my official telephone No. 9781130242 stating that I am from Haridwar and my name is Dhani Ram Khanda and I have one Kothi No. 54-A, Gali No. 2; Anand Nagar Amritsar. Today I have come to know that Anita Seth, Saheb Risheb along with other persons are trying to take forcible possession of my Kothi No. 54-A/B, necessity legal action may kindly be taken”

5 The dispute was with respect to taking possession of the property in dispute.

6 The present petitions were filed for seeking quashing of the FIRs and the proceedings arising therefrom.

7 During the pendency of these petitions, this Court, vide order dated 29.07.2025, referred the matter to the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court under the “Special Mediation Drive – Mediation for the Nation,” with an endeavour to explore the possibility of an amicable resolution between the parties.

8 Eventually, the matter was settled between the affected parties and a settlement deed dated 19.11.2025, was arrived at between them, as is reflected from the order dated 29.01.2026. A copy of the same was placed on record.

9 The relevant extract of the settlement deed dated 19.11.2025
reads thus: -

*“The following settlement has been arrived at between the
Parties hereto:*

*i) The Parties have decided that the petitioners / first party
namely Saheb Rishab and Anita Sekhri and complainant/
respondent no.2 second party namely Dhani Ram shall
resolve their dispute regarding selling price of disputed
house property i.e. House No.54-A, Gali No.2, Dayanand
Nagar, Lawrence Road, Amritsar by way of an amicable
settlement. It has been further agreed between the parties
that none of the parties shall level or pursue any allegations
regarding the matter of dispute against each other in future.
Both the parties shall be bound to make the statement, to file
affidavit in support in the concerned Hon'ble Court or Ld.
Courts below as directed by the concerned Court on the date
fixed by the said concerned court.*

*ii) It has been further agreed that the criminal case FIR
No.387 dated 18.08.2016 under Sections 448, 511, 34 IPC
registered at Police Station, Civil Lines, Amritsar and FIR
No.618 dated 11.10.2016 under Sections 420, 120-B IPC
registered at Police Station, Civil Lines, Amritsar shall not
be pursued by the complainant/respondent no.2/ second
party Dhani Ram and he shall not object for continuation of
regular bail being granted to the petitioners/first party
namely Saheb Rishab and Anita Sekhri. Second party Dhani
Ram further undertakes that he shall have no objection for
the quashing of the above mentioned quashing petitions i.e.
CRM-M-45294-2023, CRM-M-48545-2019, CRM-M-
48606-2019 pending in this Hon'ble Court on the basis of
this settlement. Complainant/Respondent No.2 Dhani Ram*

further undertakes that he shall execute affidavit and make statement in the Hon'ble High Court or as directed by the Hon'ble High Court for the quashing of the above said FIR No.387 dated 18.08.2016 under Sections 448, 511, 34 IPC registered at Police Station, Civil Lines, Amritsar and FIR No.618 dated 11.10.2016 under Sections 420, 120-B IPC registered at Police Station, Civil Lines, Amritsar.

It has been further agreed between the parties that above mentioned quashing petitions pending in this Hon'ble High Court, the petitioners / first party namely Saheb Rishab and Anita Sekhri shall make a prayer to this Hon'ble Court to decide / dispose of the above mentioned pending quashing petitions on the basis of the present settlement and shall make a further prayer for an appropriate order regarding the same.

iv) It has been further agreed that the petitioners / first party namely Saheb Rishab and Anita Sekhri shall pay a consolidated amount of Rs.37,50,000/-(Rupees Thirty Seven Lacs and Fifty thousand only) to the Complainant /Respondent No.2 /second party Dhani Ram as full and final settlement regarding the selling price of the disputed property i.e. House No.54-A, Gali No.2, Dayanand Nagar, Lawrence Road, Amritsar. This amount of Rs.37,50,000/-(Rupees Thirty Seven Lacs and Fifty thousand only) shall be full and final and after payment of agreed amount and in the manner as agreed, no further amount shall be claimed by the Complainant/Respondent No.2/second party - Dhani Ram in future regarding the matter in dispute i.e. the selling price of disputed house property. This aforesaid consolidated amount includes any monetary penalty or any arrears, if any in favour of complainant/second party and pending against the petitioners / first party as per order of

concerned Court.

v) The Complainant / Respondent No.2/second party Dhani Ram further undertakes that he after receiving the above mentioned consolidated amount (i.e. Rs.37,50,000/-) shall not claim any further amount in future from the petitioners/first party regarding the selling price of the disputed property i.e. House No.54-A, Gali No.2, Dayanand Nagar, Lawrence Road, Amritsar. Mr. Dhani Ram further undertakes that after receiving the above mentioned consolidated amount he or any of his legal representatives / legal heirs etc. shall not interfere in the peaceful possession of the aforementioned disputed house property by the petitioners/first party.

vi) Complainant/second party-Dhani Ram further undertakes that as per the terms of this present settlement he shall make a prayer to the concerned Court to withdraw Civil Suit No.CS-1881 of 2016 titled as Dhani Ram Vs. Kusum Lata and Ors. filed by complainant/respondent no.2 second party Dhani Ram against petitioner no.2/first party Anita Sekhri, which is pending before the Ld. District/Civil Court, Amritsar.

vii) It has been agreed between the parties that the amount of 37,50,000/- (Rupees Thirty Seven Lacs and Fifty thousand only) shall be paid by petitioners/first party namely Saheb Rishab and Anita Sekhri in the following manner:-

(a) One instalment of Rs. 12,50,000/- (Rupees Twelve Lacs and Fifty Thousand Only) in the shape of demand draft payable in the name of Complainant /Respondent

No.2/second party - Dhani Ram on the date fixed for recording statement of second party Dhani Ram in the Ld. concerned Court or as directed by this Hon'ble High Court for quashing of FIR No.387 dated 18.08.2016 under Sections 448, 511, 34 IPC registered at Police Station, Civil Lines, Amritsar.

(b) Other instalment of Rs. 12,50,000/- (Rupees Twelve Lacs and Fifty Thousand Only) in the shape of demand draft payable in the name of Complainant/Respondent No.2/second party - Dhani Ram on the date fixed for recording statement of second party Dhani Ram in the Ld. concerned Court or as directed by this Hon'ble High Court for quashing of FIR No.618 dated 11.10.2016 under Sections 420, 120-B IPC registered at Police Station, Civil Lines, Amritsar.

(c) Another instalment of Rs.12,50,000/- (Rupees Twelve Lacs and Fifty Thousand Only) in the shape of demand draft payable in the name of Complainant/Respondent No.2 /second party - Dhani Ram on the day/date when Civil Suit No.CS-1881 of 2016 titled as Dhani Ram Vs. Kusum Lata and Ors. filed by complainant/respondent no.2 - second party Dhani Ram against petitioner no.2/first party - Anita Sekhri, which is pending before the Ld. District/Civil Court, Amritsar shall be withdrawn by complainant /second party - Dhani Ram.

viii) Petitioner No.2 / first party - Anita Sekhri undertakes that she shall withdraw the direction petition i.e. CRM-M-19460-2018 on the next date of hearing when the case is taken-up by this Hon'ble Court which is pending for 26.11.2025 or if the case is not taken-up by the Hon'ble

Court she shall make a prayer through an application to this Hon'ble Court for grant of permission to withdraw the aforementioned direction petition prior to 15.01.2026.

ix) It is agreed between both the parties that wherever need be either of the party or both the parties on the direction of the concerned Court shall either make a prayer or file an application in the concerned Court to decide/dispose off the following cases on the basis of the present settlement i.e. CRM-2453 of 2019 titled as State Vs. Anita Sekhri which is pending before Ld. Chief Judicial Magistrate, District Court, Amritsar, CRM-2452 of 2019 titled as State Vs. Anita Sekhri which is pending before Ld. Chief Judicial Magistrate, District Court, Amritsar, CHI No. 768 of 2018 titled as State of Punjab Vs. Anita Sekhri which is pending before Ld. Chief Judicial Magistrate, District Court, Amritsar and CHI No. 767 of 2018 titled as State of Punjab Vs. Anita Sekhri which is pending before Ld. Chief Judicial Magistrate, District Court, Amritsar.

x) That complainant/second party-Dhani Ram undertakes that after receiving the aforementioned consolidated amount if the petitioners/first party namely Saheb Rishab and Anita Sekhri would need any cooperation for the peaceful possession of the above mentioned disputed property and they would request Mr. Dhani Ram for any assistance then Mr. Dhani Ram shall extend his cooperation for peaceful possession.

It is agreed between both the parties that whatever belongings including furniture, clothing or any movable fixture etc. which belong to the complainant/second party-Dhani Ram shall be removed and taken into custody from

the above-mentioned disputed house property by Mr. Dhani Ram within two weeks of receiving the last instalment of Rs. 12,50,000/- and if Mr. Dhani Ram fails to take custody or to remove the aforementioned furniture and clothing etc. Within the time of two weeks as specified then the petitioners/first party shall be at liberty to dispose off the same as per their own will.

9. *That the present Settlement/Agreement will be full and final and no further claim regarding the above mentioned disputed house property shall be claimed by the second party in any Court of Law.*

10. *By signing this settlement/Agreement the parties hereto state that they have no further claims or demands against each other with respect to the suit/claim/proceedings filed by both the parties in the different Courts of Law and all the disputes and differences in this regard have been amicably settled by the parties hereto through the process of Mediation and shall not institute any other case/litigation against each other and their family members with reference to the present claim/dispute.*

11. *It has been further agreed between the parties that if the petitioners/first party- Saheb Rishab and Anita Sekhri backs out from any terms of the present settlement, the amount so paid by them shall be forfeited and the second party- Dhani Ram will be at liberty to take recourse of law. In the same manner, if the second party-Dhani Ram backs out from any terms of the present settlement, then in that case, if he has received any amount from the first party then he shall be liable to return double the amount received by him and the petitioners/first party- Saheb Rishab and Anita Sekhri will be at liberty to take recourse of law as available to them. In case any of the parties backs out from the present settlement or breach any of the conditions of this settlement, in*

that event the other party shall have the right to revive their respective case/s which has/have been withdrawn/closed/decided/ disposed off on the basis of present settlement.

12. It has been further mutually agreed by both the parties that if any complaint/case/legal proceeding is pending before any competent court of law/authority, which is not in the knowledge of either of the parties or has escaped their attention, same shall be withdrawn by them, by tendering a copy of the present settlement.”

10 Learned State counsel does not dispute the factum of the settlement arrived at between the affected parties and does not have any serious objection to the resolution of the dispute amongst the parties.

11 Learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent No.2-complainant Dhani Ram, reiterates the settlement and his concurrence that the complaint and all the other consequential proceedings be quashed. His statement has also been recorded before this Court, wherein he has unequivocally stated that the dispute between the parties has been amicably resolved and the same is also taken on record.

12 The Hon’ble Supreme Court has delineated the parameters and guiding principles to be borne in mind by the High Courts while considering the acceptance of a settlement between the parties and the consequential quashing of criminal proceedings. In **Narinder Singh & Ors. v. State of Punjab & Anr.**, reported as **(2014) 6 SCC 466**, the Hon’ble Apex Court observed as under: –

“29. In view of the aforesaid discussion, we sum up and lay down

the following principles by which the High Court would be guided in giving adequate treatment to the settlement between the parties and exercising its power under Section 482 of the Code while accepting the settlement and quashing the proceedings or refusing to accept the settlement with direction to continue with the criminal proceedings:

29.1. Power conferred under Section 482 of the Code is to be distinguished from the power which lies in the Court to compound the offences under Section 320 of the Code. No doubt, under Section 482 of the Code, the High Court has inherent power to quash the criminal proceedings even in those cases which are not compoundable, where the parties have settled the matter between themselves. However, this power is to be exercised sparingly and with caution.

29.2. When the parties have reached the settlement and on that basis petition for quashing the criminal proceedings is filed, the guiding factor in such cases would be to secure:

- i. ends of justice, or*
- ii. (ii) to prevent abuse of the process of any court.*

While exercising the power the High Court is to form an opinion on either of the aforesaid two objectives.

29.3. Such a power is not to be exercised in those prosecutions which involve heinous and serious offences of mental depravity or offences like murder, rape, dacoity, etc. Such offences are not private in nature and have a serious impact on society. Similarly, for the offences alleged to have been committed under special statute like the Prevention of Corruption Act or the offences committed by public servants while working in that capacity are not to be quashed merely on the basis of compromise between the victim and the offender.

29.4. On the other hand, those criminal cases having overwhelmingly and predominantly civil character, particularly those arising out of commercial transactions or arising out of matrimonial relationship or family disputes should be quashed when the parties have resolved their entire disputes among themselves.

29.5. While exercising its powers, the High Court is to examine as to whether the possibility of conviction is remote and bleak and continuation of criminal cases would put the accused to great oppression and prejudice and extreme injustice would be caused to him by not quashing the criminal cases.”

(emphasis supplied)

13 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) The dispute in question emanates from a property transaction inter se between individuals who have shared a longstanding academic association, the complainant having been a former teacher and principal and the accused having been his student and colleague.
- (ii) The genesis of the controversy appears to be rooted in financial dealings arising out of mutual trust rather than in any act affecting public at large.
- (iii) During the pendency of proceedings, the parties have entered into a voluntary compromise, thereby resolving their inter se disputes. The complainant has expressed his desire not to pursue the matter further.
- (iv) The continuance of criminal proceedings, in such circumstances, would serve no fruitful purpose and may

only prolong bitterness between parties who have chosen reconciliation over prolonged litigation.

- (v) The complainant, Dhani Ram is stated to be 79 years old, and accused Anita is stated to be 62 years old. Subjecting elderly persons to protracted criminal trial would not only impose undue physical and mental strain but may also defeat the very object of restorative justice, especially when the aggrieved party has settled the matter.
- (vi) Accused Saheb Rishab is stated to be 35 years old. Continuation of criminal proceedings in a dispute that has been amicably resolved may have long-standing adverse consequences on his personal and professional life.
- (vii) The allegations pertain essentially to financial and property transactions between known parties. The offences arise out of a dispute that is predominantly civil in nature and there is no element of violence or threat to public order.
- (viii) The offence in question cannot be said to be heinous or as an offence that would be shocking to the conscience of the society or public at large. It can also not be termed as one shocking to the conscience of the Court;
- (ix) Counsel for the complainant has specifically stated in writing that he has no objection to the quashing of the FIRs.
- (x) The dispute resulted in multiplicity of civil as well as criminal litigation;
- (xi) In the totality of the circumstances, the continuation of the FIR and all proceedings emanating therefrom would amount to an abuse of the process of law and the ends of justice would be better served by quashing the same in view of the compromise effected between the parties.

as extracted above and having regard to the settled principles laid down by the Hon ble Supreme Court on the subject, the instant petitions are allowed. The aforesaid FIRs i.e. FIR No. 387 dated 18.08.2016 registered under sections 448, 511, 34 of IPC 1860 at Police Station Civil Lines, Amritsar City, District Amritsar as well as FIR No. 618 dated 11.10.2016 registered under Sections 420, 120-B IPC at P.S. Civil Lines, District Police Commissionerate, Amritsar and all other consequential proceedings arising therefrom **are hereby quashed.**

15 Petitions stand allowed accordingly.

16 Pending misc. application(s), if any, shall also stand(s) disposed of accordingly.

17 A photocopy of the order be placed on the connected file(s).

February 11, 2025.
raj arora

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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