



288

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

**CRM-M No.1064 of 2025
Date of Decision: 29.09.2025**

Sandeep Kaur

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Surmeet Singh Sandhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Raj Karan Singh, Asstt. A.G., Punjab.

Mr. Nippun Sharma, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed praying for quashing of FIR No.52, dated 13.02.2018, under Sections 323, 324, 451 of IPC, 1860, registered at Police Station Sultanpur Lodhi, District Kapurthala and order dated 12.11.2024 vide which the petitioner was declared as proclaimed person along with all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise/settlement agreement dated 21.08.2023 qua the petitioners (Annexure P-2). Further prayer has been made for staying the further proceeding arising out of FIR during the pendency of the present petition.



2. FIR in question was filed by complainant-respondent No.2 and the trial started thereon. However, with the intervention of respectables, finally the parties arrived at settlement and they resolved their *inter se* dispute, which is apparent from the Compromise/order, annexed as Annexure P-2. On the basis of the compromise, the petitioners are invoking the inherent power of this Court by praying that continuation of these proceedings would be a futile exercise and an abuse of process of the Court and thus, the FIR in question along with all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom may be quashed in the interest of justice.

3. This Court vide order dated 19.05.2025/08.09.2025 directed the parties to appear before the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate for recording their statements, as contended before the Court, and the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate was also directed to send its report.

4. In pursuance to the same, learned Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Sultanpur Lodhi has sent the report dated 20.09.2025 to this Court. With the report, she has annexed the photocopy of statement of complainant/respondent No.2, namely, Amanpreet Singh and photocopy of statement of accused-petitioner, namely, Sandeep Kaur recorded on 17.09.2025. She has also annexed the photocopy of statement of Investigating Officer ASI Subeg Singh recorded on 17.09.2025. On the basis of the statements, learned Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Sultanpur Lodhi has concluded in the report that the compromise effected between the parties is genuine, voluntary and out of their free will. It has



further been mentioned that as per the statement of ASI Subeg Singh, there is only one accused in the present FIR and the accused is not proclaimed offender in the present case. It has further been mentioned that as per the statement of ASI Subeg Singh, Sandeep Kaur is involved in other FIRs bearing FIR No.101, dated 29.03.2018; FIR No.123, dated 31.07.2016; FIR No.66 dated 26.02.2018 and FIR No.122, dated 16.04.2018, registered at Police Station Sultanpur Lodhi.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties, perused the record and the report sent by the learned Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Sultanpur Lodhi.

6. A bare perusal of statutory provision of the 528 of B.N.S.S. would show that the High Court may make such orders, as may be necessary to give effect to any order under this Code or to prevent abuse of the process of any Court or otherwise to secure the ends of justice. Section 359 B.N.S.S. is equally relevant for consideration, which prescribes the procedure for compounding of the offences under the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.

7. Keeping in view the nature of offences allegedly committed and the fact that both the parties have amicably settled their dispute, the continuation of criminal prosecution would be a futile exercise. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in a number of cases including *Narinder Singh and others Versus State of Punjab and another*, 2014 (6) SCC 466; *B.S.Joshi and others vs State of Haryana and another* (2003) 4 Supreme Court Cases 675 followed by this Court in Full Bench case of

Kulwinder Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and another, 2007(3)

RCR 1052 have dealt with the proposition involved in the present case and settled the law.

8. Thereafter, Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Gian Singh vs State of Punjab and another (2012) 10 Supreme Court Cases 303*** further dealt with the issue and the earlier law settled by the Supreme Court for quashing of the FIR in ***State of Haryana vs Bhajan Lal, 1992 Supp (1) SCC 335***. Para 61 of the judgment reads as under:-

“61. The position that emerges from the above discussion can be summarised thus: the power of the High Court in quashing a criminal proceeding or FIR or complaint in exercise of its inherent jurisdiction is distinct and different from the power given to a criminal court for compounding the offences under Section 320 of the Code. Inherent power is of wide plenitude with no statutory limitation but it has to be exercised in accord with the guideline engrafted in such power viz; (i) to secure the ends of justice, or (ii) to prevent abuse of the process of any Court. In what cases power to quash the criminal proceeding or complaint or F.I.R may be exercised where the offender and victim have settled their dispute would depend on the facts and circumstances of each case and no category can be prescribed. However, before exercise of such power, the High Court must have due regard to the nature and gravity of the crime. Heinous and serious offences of mental depravity or offences like murder, rape, dacoity, etc. cannot be fittingly quashed even though the victim or victim's family and the offender have settled the dispute. Such offences are not private in nature and have serious impact on society. Similarly, any compromise between the victim and offender



in relation to the offences under special statutes like Prevention of Corruption Act or the offences committed by public servants while working in that capacity, etc; cannot provide for any basis for quashing criminal proceedings involving such offences. But the criminal cases having overwhelmingly and pre-dominatingly civil flavour stand on a different footing for the purposes of quashing, particularly the offences arising from commercial, financial, mercantile, civil, partnership or such like transactions or the offences arising out of matrimony relating to dowry, etc. or the family disputes where the wrong is basically private or personal in nature and the parties have resolved their entire dispute. In this category of cases, the High Court may quash criminal proceedings if in its view, because of the compromise between the offender and the victim, the possibility of conviction is remote and bleak and continuation of the criminal case would put the accused to great oppression and prejudice and extreme injustice would be caused to him by not quashing the criminal case despite full and complete settlement and compromise with the victim. In other words, the High Court must consider whether it would be unfair or contrary to the interest of justice to continue with the criminal proceeding or continuation of the criminal proceeding would tantamount to abuse of process of law despite settlement and compromise between the victim and the wrongdoer and whether to secure the ends of justice, it is appropriate that criminal case is put to an end and if the answer to the above question(s) is in the affirmative, the High Court shall be well within its jurisdiction to quash the criminal proceeding.”



9. Applying the law settled by Hon'ble Supreme Court in plethora of judgments and this High Court, it is apparent that when the parties have entered into a compromise, then continuation of the proceedings would be merely an abuse of process of the Court and by allowing and accepting the prayer of the petitioners by quashing the case would be securing the ends of justice, which is primarily the object of the legislature enacting under Section 528 of B.N.S.S.

10. As a result, this Court finds that the case in hand squarely falls within the ambit and parameters settled by judicial precedents and hence, FIR No.52, dated 13.02.2018, under Sections 323, 324, 451 of IPC, 1860, registered at Police Station Sultanpur Lodhi, District Kapurthala and order dated 12.11.2024 vide which the petitioner was declared as proclaimed person along with all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom are hereby quashed qua the petitioner on the basis of compromise/settlement agreement dated 21.08.2023 qua the petitioners (Annexure P-2). Needless to say that the parties shall remain bound by the terms and conditions of the compromise and their statements recorded before the Court below.

11. Petition stands allowed.

29.09.2025

rittu

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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