



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

**CRM-M-16845-2025
Date of Decision: 28.04.2025**

Rohit Gill and others

...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Arpan Sabharwal, Advocate for the petitioners.
 Mr. Rajiv Verma, DAG, Punjab.
 Mr. Rahul Garg, Advocate for respondent nos. 2 & 3.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Section 528 BNSS, 2023 for quashing of FIR No. 76, dated 23.06.2024 under Sections 386, 342, 506, 511, 34 and Section 364-A added later on of the IPC, 1860 registered at PS City Nakodar, District Jalandhar, Rural, Punjab (Annexure P-1) and all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of the compromise dated 29.11.2024 (Annexure P-2) arrived at between the petitioners and the respondents no. 2 and 3.

During the pendency of the dispute, the parties have compromised the matter and filed the present petition for quashing of FIR.

Vide order dated 27.03.2025, parties were directed to appear before the Illaqa Magistrate/Trial Court and report with regard to the genuineness of the compromise was called for.

The report dated 17.04.2025 has been received from Additional Sessions Judge, Jalandhar, duly forwarded by District and Sessions Judge, Jalandhar, stating that the parties have entered into a compromise, which is



genuine, voluntary and without any coercion or undue influence.

Full Bench of this Court in ***Kulwinder Singh and others vs. State of Punjab, 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052***, has held:-

“The only inevitable conclusion from the above discussion is that there is no statutory bar under the Cr.P.C. which can affect the inherent power of this Court under Section 482. Further, the same cannot be limited to matrimonial cases alone and the Court has the wide power to quash the proceedings even in noncompoundable offences notwithstanding the bar under Section 320 of the Cr.P.C., in order to prevent the abuse of law and to secure the ends of justice.

The power under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. is to be exercised Ex-Debitia Justitia to prevent an abuse of process of Court. There can neither be an exhaustive list nor the defined para-meters to enable a High Court to invoke or exercise its inherent powers. It will always depend upon the facts and circumstances of each case. The power under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. has no limits. However, the High Court will exercise it sparingly and with utmost care and caution. The exercise of power has to be with circumspection and restraint. The Court is a vital and an extra-ordinary effective instrument to maintain and control social order. The Courts play role of paramount importance in achieving peace, harmony and ever- lasting congeniality in society. Resolution of a dispute by way of a compromise between two warring groups, therefore, should attract the immediate and prompt attention of a Court which should endeavour to give full effect to the same unless such compromise is abhorrent to lawful composition of the society or would



promote savagery.”

The legal principles as laid down for quashing of the judgment were also approved by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of '**Gian Singh Versus State of Punjab and another,(2012) 10 SCC 303**'.

Furthermore, the broad principles for exercising the powers under Section 482 were summarized by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of '**Parbatbhai Aahir @ Parbatbhai Bhimsinhbhai Karmur and others versus State of Gujarat and another” (2017) 9 SCC 641**'.

It is evident that in view of the amicable resolution of the issues amongst the parties, no useful purpose would be served by continuation of the proceedings. The furtherance of the proceedings is likely to be a waste of judicial time and there appears to be no chances of conviction.

In view of above, FIR No. 76, dated 23.06.2024 under Sections 386, 342, 506, 511, 34 and Section 364-A added later on of the IPC, 1860 registered at PS City Nakodar, District Jalandhar, Rural, Punjab (Annexure P-1) and all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of the compromise dated 29.11.2024 (Annexure P-2) arrived at between the petitioners and the respondents no. 2 and 3 is quashed *qua* the petitioners.

The present petition is hereby allowed.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

28.04.2025

kv

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes
Whether reportable : No