

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

**\*\*\*\***

**CRM-M-43381-2020  
Date of Decision: 24.03.2021**

**\*\*\*\***

Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

..... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDIP AHLUWALIA**

Present: Ms. Tarundeep Kaur, Advocate for  
Mr. Amritpal Singh Sohal, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sukhbeer Singh, A.A.G., Punjab,  
for respondent No.1/State.

Mr. Maheep S. Sindhu, Advocate for  
Mr. D.S. Pheruman, Advocate,  
for respondent Nos.2 to 4.

**SUDIP AHLUWALIA J. (ORAL)**

In this petition, the petitioner, who is the accused in F.I.R No.293, dated 06.11.2014, under Sections 307, 323, 324, 148 & 149 of the Indian Penal Code and Sections 25, 27, 54 & 59 of the Arms Act, registered at Police Station Patti, District Tarn Taran (Annexure P-1), has prayed for quashing of F.I.R. with all subsequent proceedings, on the basis of compromise.

[2]. With the intervention of respectables and elderly people of the society, respondent Nos.2 to 4 have arrived at a settlement with the accused vide Compromise (Annexure P-2), which is duly signed by them. The matter was referred to the Court below for recording of statements of the parties and to report with respect to genuineness of the compromise arrived at

between the parties. The Additional District & Sessions Judge, Tarn Taran, vide report dated 28.01.2021, has apprised this Court that the compromise arrived at between the parties is genuine and without any pressure. Although, Challan in the case has been filed, but it transpires that no fire-arm was actually recovered during investigation, on account of which, the applicability of the offence under the Arms Act or under Section 307 of the IPC would appear to be doubtful.

[3]. Respondent Nos.2 to 4 are represented by their Counsel, who does not dispute the compromise.

[4]. In view of the report of the Additional District & Sessions Judge, Tarn Taran, and in view of the decisions 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 with the criminal proceedings pending, since respondent Nos.2 to 4 have themselves compromised the dispute with the petitioner/accused.

[5]. In the circumstances, the present petition is allowed. F.I.R No.293, dated 06.11.2014, under Sections 307, 323, 324, 148 & 149 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 25, 27, 54 & 59 of the Arms Act, registered at Police Station Patti, District Tarn Taran (Annexure P-1) with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, is hereby quashed qua the present petitioner.

**24.03.2021***Bhumika***(SUDIP AHLUWALIA)  
JUDGE**

1. Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
2. Whether reportable: No