

**CRM-M-11511-2024 (O&M)****1****IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH.****Sr. No.120****CRM-M-11511-2024 (O&M)****Decided On : February 05, 2025**

Kewal Singh and others

.... Petitioners

versus

State of Punjab and another

.... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU.

* * *

Present : Mr. R. D. Rattewal, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Kunwarbir Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Deepak Chaudhary, Advocate
for respondent no.2.

* * *

MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU, J. :

Present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (for short, 'Cr.P.C'), praying for quashing of FIR No.84 dated 31.10.2023 (P-1), under Sections 323, 325, 148 read with Section 149 of Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station Kathgarh, District SBS Nagar, along with all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 25.01.2024 (P-2), entered into between the parties i.e. petitioners as well as respondent No.2.

2. Allegations are that the petitioners along with other co-accused, in prosecution of their common object, formed an unlawful assembly; inflicted injuries on the person of complainant and criminally intimidated him with dire consequences of life.



parties, i.e. petitioners as well as respondent No.2; hence FIR in question as well as subsequent proceedings arising therefrom deserve to be quashed.

4. 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.

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

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

7. A Co-ordinate Bench, while issuing notice of motion on 04.03.2024, passed the following order :-

“The petitioners have approached this Court seeking quashing of FIR (Annexure P-1) and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom on the basis of a compromise having been effected between the parties.

Notice of motion for 27.08.2024.

At this stage, Mr. Deepak Chaudhary, Advocate, has put in appearance on behalf of respondent No.2 and filed his vakalatnama, which is taken on record.

The parties are directed to move an application before the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate concerned for getting their statements recorded qua the factum of compromise. As and when any such application is moved and put up before the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate, the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate shall consider the said application and do the needful for recording the statements of the parties qua the factum of the compromise, on any convenient



date. After recording the statements of all the affected parties, and upon getting requisite information from Investigating Officer, the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate shall submit its report on the basis of the statements so recorded, broadly on the following aspects:

- (i) Whether there is any other accused other than the petitioners, arrayed in this petition?*
- (ii) Whether there is any other complainant or affected/aggrieved party other than the respondents, arrayed in the petition?*
- (iii) Whether any accused has been declared Proclaimed Offender?*
- (iv) Whether the compromise in question is found to be a valid compromise and has been effected without there being any kind of influence or coercion?*

The report be submitted before this Court on or before the next date.”

8. In terms of aforesaid order, statements of both the parties were recorded and a report dated 04.04.2024 has been received from learned Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Balachaur. For reference, the operative part of report reads as under :-

“3. The para-wise report is as under :-

- (i) As per the statement of IO/SI Puran Singh, no other accused involved in the present FIR except the petitioners.**
- (ii) As per the statement of IO/SI Puran Singh, there is only one complainant namely Sucha Singh in the present FIR.**
- (iii) As per the statement of IO/SI Puran Singh, none of the accused person was**



declared proclaimed offender.

(iv) As per the statements of both the parties, compromise in question is found to be valid compromise and has been effected without there being any kind of influence or coercion.

4. *In view of the above statements suffered by both the parties, this Court is satisfied that compromise between the parties has been effected voluntarily without any threat or coercion and is genuine/correct. The compromise is not the result of any fraud or misrepresentation and is the result of free will of the parties. **The attested copies of statements of the both the parties** are annexed herewith for kind perusal of your good-self and necessary action, please. The report is hereby submitted accordingly.”*

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 victims 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.

February 05, 2025
monika

(MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned ?	Yes.
Whether reportable ?	No.