



388

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

CRM-M No.15406-2023(O&M)

Date of Decision:-22.04.2025

SANJEEV KUMAR BHATIA

... Petitioner

Versus

RAMESH NAGPAL

... Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present:- Mr. Sumeet Mahajan, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Shrey Sachdeva, Advocate
Ms. Shruti Singla, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr.A.P.S. Shergill and Mr. Akash Soni, Advocates
for the respondent.

SANJIV BERRY, J (ORAL)

1. The instant petition has been preferred under Section 482 Cr.P.C by the petitioner, originally seeking quashing of the complaint (Annexure P-1) bearing No. CRM/18/14 titled as '*Ramesh Nagpal Vs. Ram Krishan Bhatia and another*' on merits as well as of impugned summoning order dated 29.04.2016 (Annexure P-2) passed by the Judicial Magistrate First Class, Amritsar.

2. During course of proceedings, an application CRM-13644-2025 has been preferred by the petitioner seeking quashing of the complaint on the basis of compromise dated 29.03.2025 (Annexure AX-4) and vide order



dated 02.04.2025 a report qua the genuineness of the compromise has been called from the learned trial Court.

3. Report dated 11.04.2025 of learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, Amritsar has been received and perused. In the report, learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, Amritsar has apprised this Court that the compromise arrived between the parties is genuine and without any pressure.

4. Learned counsel representing the complainant does not oppose the compromise.

5. In view of the report of the learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Amritsar and in view of the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in "Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab and another", 2012(4) RCR (Criminal) 543 and "Narinder Singh and Others Vs. State of Punjab and Another" (2014) 6 SCC 466, this Court is of the opinion that no useful purpose can be served by keeping the criminal proceedings pending, since the complainant has himself compromised the dispute with the petitioner/accused persons.

6. In these circumstances, the present petition is allowed, complaint dated 10.09.2013 (Annexure P-1), order dated 29.04.2016 (Annexure P-2) and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, are hereby quashed on the basis of the compromise qua the present petitioner.

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

22.04.2025

Gyan

- | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|--------|
| i) | Whether speaking/reasoned? | Yes/No |
| ii) | Whether reportable? | Yes/No |