

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

1. CRM-M No.42282 of 2023

Jagir Singh & others  
... Petitioners  
Versus  
State of Punjab & others  
... Respondents

2. CRM-M No.51174 of 2023

Gurmeet Singh & others  
... Petitioners  
Versus  
State of Punjab & another  
... Respondents

Date of decision: 16<sup>th</sup> January, 2024

CORAM: HON’BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Vishva Bahl, Advocate  
for the petitioners in CRM-M No.42282 of 2023.  
for respondent No.2 in CRM-M No.51174 of 2023.  
  
Mr. Ravi Mehra, Advocate  
for the petitioners in CRM-M No. 51174 of 2023.  
for respondents No.2 and 3 in CRM-M No.42282 of 2023.  
  
Mr. APS Tung, Dy. Advocate General, Punjab  
for the respondent/State.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioners in both the petitions detailed hereinabove have sought quashing of FIR No.0019 dated 13.02.2012 under Sections 307, 452, 427, 148, 149, 188 and 379 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, 1959, at Police Station Bhindi Saidan, District Amritsar as also the complaint No.SC/994/2018 dated

05.12.2018 under Sections 307, 326, 323, 148, 149 of the IPC and sections 25/27 of the Arms Act, 1959 pending in the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise effected between the parties in terms of compromise deeds dated 17.08.2023 and 26.09.2023.

2. Vide separate orders dated 25.08.2023 and 10.10.2023 passed by a Coordinate Bench of this Court, the parties were directed to appear before the learned trial Court/Illaq Magistrate to get their statements recorded regarding the compromise arrived at, between them.

3. Reports have since been received from learned Judicial Magistrate, 1<sup>st</sup> Class, Ajnala and learned Additional District & Sessions Judge, Amritsar, in pursuance of the directions of this Court, wherein, the factum of the compromise arrived at between the parties stands verified and confirmed. As per the report, compromise has indeed been effected between the parties and the same is without any pressure or coercion and out of their free will and the complainant has also made statement to the effect that he would have no objection if the FIR/Complaint qua the accused-petitioners are quashed.

4. The Courts below have annexed copy of the statements of the parties, along with the reports.

5. Learned State counsel too submits that there are no other accused other than the petitioners and the private respondents are the only aggrieved persons in the FIR/Complaint in question.

6. On a pointed query put to the learned State counsel, he on instructions, has not disputed that offences under Sections 307/452/379 IPC stand deleted against the petitioners. He has further submitted that though two persons had sustained injuries in the occurrence in question, however, only one of them had been made a party as the other injured has since expired. Learned State counsel has also not disputed the fact that it is a case of version and cross-version, wherein both the parties have received injuries at the hands of each other.

7. In view of the reports received and the principles laid down by the Apex Court in ‘**Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab and others**’ (2012) 10 SCC 303, and also by the Full Bench of this Court in ‘**Kulwinder Singh and others v. State of Punjab and another**’ 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052, since as conceded by the learned State counsel it is a case of version and cross-version, both the instant petitions are allowed. The aforesaid FIR/Complaint along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom qua the petitioners, are quashed.

9. Needless to say, the parties shall remain bound by the terms of compromise and their statements recorded before the Court below.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)  
JUDGE

January 16, 2024  
rps

|                           |        |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| Whether reportable        | Yes/No |