

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-43177-2024
Reserved on: 01.10.2024
Date of Pronouncement: 16.10.2024

Paramjit Singh @ Parmjit Singh ... Petitioner(s)
Versus
State of Punjab and Another ...Respondent (s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present:- Mr. V.K. Pujara, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Jasjit Singh, DAG, Punjab.

Ms. Mandeep Kaur Gill, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
79	28.06.2020	Sadar Jagraon, District Ludhiana Rural	323, 325, 427 IPC

The petitioner(s), arraigned as accused in the above captioned FIR, has come up before this Court under Section 528 BNSS, 2023 for quashing of the FIR and all consequential proceedings based on the compromise with the aggrieved person(s).

2. During the pendency of the criminal proceedings, the accused and the aggrieved person(s) have compromised the matter, and its copy is annexed with this petition as Annexure P-2.

3. After that, the petitioner(s) came up before this Court to quash the FIR, impleading the aggrieved persons as respondent no. 2.

4. Pursuant to order of this Court dated 03.09.2024, the aggrieved person(s) (Respondent no.2), appeared before the Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Jagraon and stated that there would be no objection if the Court quashes this FIR and consequent proceedings. The relevant extract of the report of the concerned Court reads as follows:

Name of the reporting	Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Jagraon
-----------------------	---

Court	
-------	--

Criminal Case no. before trial Court	-----
---	-------

1.	Names of the complainant/ victims(s)/ aggrieved persons(s)	Sant Singh
2.	Dates on which the statement(s) of the complainant/ victims(s)/ aggrieved persons(s) were recorded	13.09.2024
3.	Has the identity of the complainant/ victims(s)/ aggrieved persons(s) been verified?	Yes
4.	Whether all the victims/ all the aggrieved persons have compromised the matter?	Yes
5.	Is there pressure, threat, or coercion upon the victim(s)/aggrieved person(s)/complainant?	No
6.	Names of the accused person(s)	Paramjit Singh
7.	Dates on which the statement(s) of the accused persons(s) recorded	13.09.2024
8.	Whether all the accused have compromised the matter? If no, then the names of the accused who have compromised.	Yes
9.	Whether proclamation proceedings are pending against any accused?	No
10.	Has the police report been filed or not?	Yes
11.	Notice of accusation /Charges have been framed or not?	Yes
12.	Sections of statutes invoked in the matter	323/325/427 IPC
13.	Whether the court is satisfied with the genuineness of the compromise?	Yes

ANALYSIS & REASONING:

5. Despite the opposition of the State’s counsel to this compromise, the following aspects would be relevant to conclude this petition. In the present case, all the offences are

compoundable under Section 359 BNSS, 2023. Given the legislative mandate, the prosecution can be closed by quashing the FIR and consequent proceedings.

6. In *Shakuntala Sawhney v Kaushalya Sawhney*, (1979) 3 SCR 639, at P 642, Hon’ble Supreme Court observed that the finest hour of Justice arises propitiously when parties, who fell apart, bury the hatchet and weave a sense of fellowship or reunion.

7. In the light of the judicial precedents referred to above, given the terms of compromise, placement of parties, and other factors peculiar to the case, the contents of the compromise deed and its objectives point towards its acceptance.

8. In *Himachal Pradesh Cricket Association v State of Himachal Pradesh*, **2018:INSC:1039 [Para 47]**, 2018 (4) Crimes 324, Hon’ble Supreme Court holds “[47]. As far as Writ Petition (Criminal) No. 135 of 2017 is concerned, the appellants came to this Court challenging the order of cognizance only because of the reason that matter was already pending as the appellants had filed the Special Leave Petitions against the order of the High Court rejecting their petition for quashing of the FIR/Chargesheet. Having regard to these peculiar facts, writ petition has also been entertained. In any case, once we hold that FIR needs to be quashed, order of cognizance would automatically stands vitiated.”

9. Considering the entire facts, compromise, and in the light of the above-mentioned judicial precedents, I believe that continuing these proceedings will not suffice any fruitful purpose whatsoever. In the facts and circumstances peculiar to this case, the Court invokes the inherent jurisdiction under section 528 BNSS, 2023 and quashes the FIR and all subsequent proceedings qua the petitioner(s). The bail bonds of the petitioner are accordingly discharged.

Petition allowed in the terms mentioned above. All pending application(s), if any, stand closed.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

October 16, 2024
AK

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes
Whether reportable	:	No