



125/2

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

**CRM-M-19694-2024 (O&M)
Date of decision : 02.05.2025**

Gurlal Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU

Present: Mr. Manish Kansra, Advocate for
Mr. Vikasdeep Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. T.P.S. Walia, AAG, Punjab.
Mr. Raghav Soni, Advocate for
Mr. Vikas Gupta, Advocate for respondent Nos.2 and 3.

MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU, J.

Present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (for short 'Cr.P.C.') for quashing of DDR No. 34 dated 28.12.2020 (P-2), under Sections 324, 323, 341 read with Section 34 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short 'IPC') [Section 326 added later on], in FIR No. 146 dated 24.12.2020 under Sections 307, 324, 364, 326, 341, 379, 148 read with Section 149 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short 'IPC'), [Section 324 added later on and Section 307, 364, 341, 148 read with Section 149 deleted later on vide DDR No. 24 dated 01.07.2022], registered at Police Station Khalra, District Tarn Taran, along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom *qua* the petitioners on the basis of compromise dated 22.01.2024 (P-4 & P-5), entered into between the parties i.e. petitioner as well as respondent Nos.2 & 3.

2. Allegations are that petitioner and their accomplices formed an unlawful assembly and in prosecution of their common object attacked



respondent Nos. 2 & 3 with their respective weapons; inflicted grievous injuries on the person of respondent Nos. 2 & 3.

3. Contends that matter has been amicably settled between the parties, i.e. petitioner as well as respondent Nos.2 & 3; hence DDR in question as well as subsequent proceedings deserve to be quashed.

4. Learned counsel for respondent Nos.2 & 3 has also acknowledged the contention raised on behalf of the petitioners.

5. Still further, learned State Counsel, on instructions from the concerned police officer, is not averse in case the above DDR 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. A Co-ordinate Bench, while issuing notice of motion on 23.04.2024, passed the following order:-

“ The petitioner seeks quashing of DDR (Annexure P-2) and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom on the basis of a compromise having been effected between the parties.

Notice of motion for 16.10.2024.

At this stage, Mr. Vikas Gupta, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of respondent Nos.2 & 3 and has filed 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 petitioner, 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 final report dated 08.05.2024 has been received from learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, Tarn Taran. For reference, the operative part of report reads as under:-

*“ (i) As per statement of ASI Gurnam Singh Investigating Officer, In the present case total 00 accused namely (1) Tarsem Singh son of Baldev Singh, (2) Karandeep Singh son of Bachitter Singh, (3) Malkeet Singh @ Meeta son of Baj Singh & (4) Gurlal Singh son of Satnam Singh are arraigned. During enquiry accused (1) Tarsem Singh son of Baldev Singh, (2) Karandeep Singh son of Bachitter Singh, (3) Malkeet Singh @ Meeta son of Baj Singh were found innocent vide zimni no.16 dated 28.12.2021. However, the challan only against the accused Gurlal Singh son of Satnam Singh has been presented in the court.
(ii) As per statement of ASI Gurnam Singh Investigating Officer, in the present FIR, Ranjit Singh son of Gurbachan Singh is complainant and Gurbaj Singh son of Gurcharan Singh is aggrieved person.
(iii) As per statement of ASI Gurnam Singh Investigating Officer, no accused has been declared as proclaimed offender in the present case.
(iv) As per the statements suffered by the parties and their oral submissions, the compromise arrived at between the*



parties seems to be genuine, voluntary and without any coercion or undue influence.”

A perusal of the aforesaid extract clearly reveals that matter has been compromised by both the 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 DDR 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 DDR along with all subsequent proceedings resulting therefrom are quashed *qua* the petitioner.

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

02.05.2025
Harish Kumar

(MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU)
JUDGE

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