


IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH



(303)

CRM-M-25703-2025
Decided on : 23.07.2025

Daljit Singh

Versus

.....Petitioner(s)

State of Punjab & another

.....Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr.P.S.Kanwar, Advocate, for the petitioner (s).
Mr.B.P.Singh, AAG, Punjab.
Ms.Meena, Advocate, for
Mr.Amit Arora, Advocate, for respondent No.2.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Instant petition has been filed under Section 528 of BNSS, seeking quashing of the below detailed First Information Report (FIR), and to set aside judgment of conviction passed by JMIC, Hoshiarpur dated 28.02.2020 and all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of the compromise dated 10.01.2025 (Annexure P-4), effected between the parties.

DETAILS OF CRIMINAL CASE:-

FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
35	25.04.2016	452, 323, 324, 506 & 34 IPC	Bulawal	Hoshiarpur

2. Vide order dated 12.05.2025, the affected parties were directed to appear before the learned Trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate, for getting their respective statements recorded with regard to the compromise. The Trial

Court/Illaq Magistrate was to submit a report in this regard giving certain details as enumerated in the said order.

3. Pursuant to the aforementioned order, the parties appeared before the Court of learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Hoshiarpur and as per report dated 11.06.2025, submitted to this Court, both the parties have got recorded their respective statements in Court. From the report received from the learned Court below, the following is discernible:-

Sr. No.	Description	
1.	Number of persons arrayed as accused in the FIR	One accused
2.	Number of complainant/victim	One complainant/victim namely, Hardeep Singh
3.	Whether all the accused and complainant/victims are party to compromise and signed the same	yes
4.	In case, any affected person (accused or complainant) is left out or not arrayed as party in the quashing petitioner before High Court, details whereof; or	There is no other accused or complainant, apart from the parties arrayed in the petition
	His/her statement is still to be recorded, in compliance to the direction of this Court, details of such person	
5.	Whether any accused has been declared as a proclaimed offender/person or any such proceedings against him/her have been initiated or pending adjudication	None of the accused have been declared as Proclaimed offender
6.	Report of the Court whether compromise is genuine, voluntary, and without any coercion or undue influence	The compromise between the parties seems genuine, voluntary and out of free will
7.	Any other aspect relevant to the present case	NA

4. It is noticed that in view of the report received from the learned Court Below, it is evident that the matter has been resolved and private parties have effected a compromise, and there remains no dispute amongst them requiring any adjudication. Further submits that in view of the compromise so effected between the private parties, pendency of the FIR and consequential proceedings emanating therefrom would be sheer abuse of the process of law, and the same may be quashed.

5. Learned State counsel, after going through the statements and the report received from learned Court below, very fairly admits that respondent No.2 has resolved the dispute and effected a compromise and they have no objection if the FIR (supra) and all the consequential proceedings are quashed on the basis of the compromise.

6. Issue involved in the present case is that once matter has been considered after appreciation of evidence by the learned Trial Court, appeal against the same is pending before Appellate Court, when proceedings can be quashed/compromised/finished on the basis of compromise amongst all the parties to *lis*.

7. The matter is no longer *res integra* as catena of judgments, Hon'ble the Apex Court and High Courts (including Punjab and Haryana High Court), have culled out various principles of law concerning quashing of proceedings emanating after lodging of FIR, and some of them are as under:-

_ Power under Section 482 Cr.P.C./Section 528 BNSS can be exercised to enhance social amity, and to reduce friction.

_ Disputes which have their genesis in a matrimonial discord, landlord-tenant matters, commercial transactions and other such matters can safely be dealt with by the Court by exercising its powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C./Section 528 BNSS in the

event of a compromise, but this is not to say that the power is limited to such cases.

_ There can never be any hard and fast category which can be prescribed to enable the Court to exercise its power under Section 482 Cr.P.C./Section 528 BNSS "to prevent abuse of the process of any Court" or "to secure the ends of justice".

_No embargo, be in the shape of Section 320(9) Cr.P.C./Section 359 BNSS, or any other such curtailment, can whittle down the power under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C./Section 528 of the BNSS.

_ The compromise, in a modern society, is the sine qua non of harmony and orderly behaviour.

_ High Court has the wide power to quash the proceedings even in non-compoundable offences notwithstanding the bar under Section 320 Cr.P.C./Section 359 BNSS, in order to prevent the abuse of law and to secure the ends of justice.

_ Power under Section 482 Cr.P.C./Section 528 BNSS is to be exercised Ex-Debitia Justitia to prevent an abuse of process of Court.

_ Such power 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.

_ Matters which can be categorized as personal in nature or where nature of injuries do not exhibit mental depravity or involves commission of an offence of such a serious nature that quashing of FIR would override the public interest, the Court

can quash the FIR in view of the settlement arrived at amongst the parties.

In this regard, judgments cited are:

- 1. Gian Singh v. State of Punjab and another, (2012) 10 SCC 303 (SC);**
- 2. Parbatbhai Aahir @ Parbatbhai Bhimsinhbhai Karmur and others v. State of Gujarat and another, (2017) 9 SCC 641 (SC);**
- 3. Ramgopal and another v. State of Madhya Pradesh, 2021 SCC Online SC 834 (SC); and**
- 4. Kulwinder Singh and others v. State of Punjab and another, 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052 [P&H FB]**

8. Also this Court in case of ***Sube Singh and another versus State of Haryana and another, 2013 (4) RCR (Criminal) 102*** has considered the compounding of offences at the appellate stage and has observed that even when appeal against the conviction is pending before the Sessions Court and parties entered into a compromise, the High Court is vested unparallel power under Section 482 Cr.P.C. to quash criminal proceedings at any stage so as to secure the ends of justice.

9. After hearing learned State counsel and going through the material available on record, this Court finds that pendency of the present criminal litigation would be abuse of process of law since the chances of conviction of the petitioners are bleak in view of the compromise, so effected between the private party.

10. The report alongwith statements of the affected parties received from learned Court below reveals that the complainant/victim has genuinely effected a compromise with the petitioners and they have no objection, if the impugned FIR and consequential proceedings are quashed.

11. Keeping in view the totality of the facts and circumstances of the case, including the report received by this Court and also, taking into consideration the aforementioned settled principles of law, this petition is accepted and **FIR (as detailed in para No. 1 above) and all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom** are hereby quashed *qua* the petitioner, in view of compromise dated 10.01.2025 (Annexure P-4) and the judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 28.02.2020 passed by the Court below, is ordered to be considered inoperative and of no consequence for all intents and purposes.

12. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

July 23, 2025

Sailesh

Whether speaking/reasoned :

Yes/No

Whether Reportable :

Yes/No