



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

CRM-M No.63528 of 2023
Date of decision: 21st May, 2024

Satwant Singh @ Satwant Gill

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab & another

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Harlove S. Rajput, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Shiva Khurmi, Asst. Advocate General, Punjab
for the respondent/State.

Mr. Pranshul Dhull, Advocate for
Mr. Divyanshu Nagpal, Advocate for respondent No.2.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing FIR No.10 dated 27.01.2020 registered under Sections 336, 148, 149 IPC and Sections 25, 27 of Arms Act at Police Station Baghapurana, District Moga and all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 06.12.2023 (Annexure P-2) effected between the parties.

2. In compliance of order dated 02.05.2024, learned counsel for the petitioner has placed on record a copy of the judgment in FIR No.90 dated 10.11.2016 under Sections 399, 402 IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959 registered at Police Station Thermal, District Badhinda, wherein it stands reflected that the petitioner has been acquitted of the charges against him. Learned State counsel, on



instructions from ASI Gurnaib Singh, has not disputed the submissions made by the counsel opposite.

3. Vide order dated 18.12.2023 of this Court, the parties were directed to appear before the learned trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate to get their statements recorded regarding the compromise arrived at, between them.

4. Report has since been received from learned Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Baghapurana, in pursuance of the direction 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 qua the accused-petitioner is quashed.

5. The trial Court has annexed the statements of the parties in original, along with its report.

6. Learned State counsel too submits that there are no other accused other than the petitioner and respondent No.2 is the only aggrieved person in the FIR in question.

7. In view of the report of the learned Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Baghapurana 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, the instant petition is allowed. The aforesaid FIR and all consequential proceedings arising out of it qua the petitioner, are quashed.

8. 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

May 21, 2024
rps

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