



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

**CRM-M-1324-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision : 07.04.2025**

Krishanpal Singh @ Krishan Singh @ Keecher & another

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU

Present: Mr. Rahul Sharma, Advocate,
for the petitioners.
Mr. Kunwarbir Singh, AAG, Punjab.
Mr. Gaurav Chadha, Advocate for
Mr. Saqib Ali Khan, Advocate for respondent No. 2.

MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU, J.

Present petition has been filed under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS'), for quashing of FIR No.39 dated 16.05.2024, under Sections 107, 324, 341, 379, 506 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short 'IPC') (Section 326 of IPC added later on), registered at Police Station Jodhan, District Ludhiana and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 18.12.2024 (P-2), entered into between the parties i.e. petitioners as well as respondent No.2.

2. Allegations are that petitioners took tomatoes from rehri of *de facto*-complainant without paying any money; also caused serious injuries to him with sword and criminally intimidated with dire consequences.

3. Contends that matter has been amicably settled between the parties, i.e. petitioners as well as respondent No.2; hence FIR in question as well as subsequent proceedings deserve to be quashed.



4. Learned counsel for respondent No.2 has also acknowledged the contention raised on behalf of the petitioners.

5. Still further, learned State Counsel, on instructions from the police officer present, is not averse in case the above FIR along with subsequent proceedings are quashed and set aside on the basis of the compromise entered into between the parties.

6. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the paper-book.

7. This Court, while issuing notice of motion on 14.01.2025, passed the following order:-

“ Contends, inter alia, that matter has been compromised between the parties i.e. petitioners and respondent No. 2.

(2) Notice of motion.

(3) Mr. Mohit Kapoor, learned Sr. DAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1-State.

(4) At this stage, Mr. Krishan Daaria, Advocate for Mr. Saqib Ali Khan, Advocate, causes representation on behalf of respondent No.2 and acknowledged the factum of compromise between the parties i.e. petitioners and respondent No. 2.

(5) Requisite number of copies of the petition be supplied to learned Counsel for the respondents during the course of day.

(6) Petitioners shall file their respective affidavits that there is no other criminal case(s) pending against them and also give the details of any other FIR(s), already quashed on the basis of compromise.

(7) In view of the above, let parties appear before the Court of learned Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court on or before 31.01.2025 for recording their statement(s) with reference to the compromise, if any, entered into between them.



(8) Learned Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court shall record the statement(s) of all accused, complainant/injured and victim, if any, and submit a report to this Court before the next date of hearing containing the following information:-

(i). Whether the statements of the parties are bona fide and not result of any pressure or coercion etc. in any manner?

(ii). Whether the compromise effected between the parties is genuine and valid?

(iii). Whether all the accused, complainant and injured are party to the compromise and if not, the details/particulars of such person(s)?

(iv). Whether any other case is pending against either of the parties or not, if yes, the details thereof?

(v). Whether any of the persons involved in this case/dispute has been declared a proclaimed offender?

(vi). Whether any of the petitioner(s) is/are previous convict or not?

*(9) List before this Court on **24.02.2025** for further consideration.*

(10) Meanwhile, learned State Counsel shall also get the instructions in the matter as to whether the State has any objection?

(11) Copy of this order be sent to learned Judicial Officer concerned forthwith for information and strict compliance.”

8. In terms of aforesaid order, statements of both the parties were recorded and a report dated 21.02.2025 has been received from learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, Ludhiana. For reference, the operative part of report reads as under:-

“ It is further most humbly submitted that as per the statement of parties the compromise arrived between them without any pressure or coercion, and is bonafide, genuine and valid. Both the parties i.e. complainant



Harmanjot Singh and accused-Krishanpal Singh @ Krishan Singh @ Keecher and Sukhdev Singh appeared before the court and made their statements. As per statement of accused there is no other FIR pending against them and they have not been declared as proclaimed offender and they have not been previously convicted.”

A perusal of the aforesaid extract clearly reveals that matter has been compromised by both sides with their free consent, voluntarily and without any coercion or undue influence. Even before this Court also, there is no objection by either side against each other.

9. Hon’ble the Supreme Court in **Gian Singh v. State of Punjab, (2012) 10 SCC 303**, has held 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 FIR may be exercised where the offender and the 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 a serious impact on society. Similarly, any compromise between the victim and the offender in relation to the offences under special statutes like the 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 predominatingly 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 the 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 the 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.”

10. In view of above discussion, this Court is fully convinced that the offence is entirely personal in nature and does not affect public peace or tranquility. Thus, quashing of the FIR in question along with consequential proceedings, on the basis of compromise would bring peace and harmony to secure the ends of justice.

11. Consequently, present petition is allowed; aforesaid FIR along with all subsequent proceedings resulting therefrom are quashed *qua* the petitioners.

Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

07.04.2025
Harish Kumar

(MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU)
JUDGE

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