



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

289

CRM-M-27634-2025

VARINDER SINGH ALIAS KALI AND ORS

....PETITIONERS

V/s

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

....RESPONDENTS

Date of decision: 19.11.2025

Date of Uploading:19.11.2025

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Ms. Rubi Khokhar, Advocate for
Mr. Anuj Dewan, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Gaurav Gurcharan S. Rai, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Rahul Bansal, Advocate for
Mr. M.S. Hundal, Advocate for respondents No.2 and 3.

SUMEET GOEL, J.

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023 for quashing of DDR No.20 dated 25.04.2020 under Sections 452, 323, 326, 506, 148, 149 of IPC 1860 (after that deleted Sections 452, 325, 326, 148, 149 of IPC and added Section 34 of IPC in FIR No.108 dated 24.04.2020 registered at Police Station Sadar Patti, District Tarn Taran and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 21.04.2025 (Annexure P-3), which is stated to have been effected between the parties.

2. On 09.09.2025, the following order was passed:

“The present petition is for quashing of DDR No.20 dated 25.04.2020, under Sections 452, 323, 506, 148, 149 IPC (Sections 452, 325, 326, 148, 149, 34 IPC added later on) in



FIR No.108 dated 24.04.2020, registered at Police Station Sadar Patti, District Tarn Taran, on the basis of compromise dated 21.04.2025 (Annexure P3).

Notice of motion.

On the asking of this Court, Mr. Ravneet Singh Lekhi, AAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and status report was filed by him in the Registry of this Court is taken on record.

Mr. Malkiat S. Hundal, Advocate, accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.2 and 3. He admitted the correctness of compromise and stated that he has no objection if this petition is allowed. Complete copy of paper book be supplied to them during the course of the day.

The parties are directed to appear before the learned trial court/Illaq Magistrate to get record their statements within four weeks regarding compromise and after recording their statements, learned trial Court/Illaq Magistrate, is directed to send the same along with his report regarding the genuineness of compromise on or before the date fixed in the instant petition specifically with regard to the following facts :

- 1. Number of persons arrayed as accused in the FIR.*
- 2. Whether any accused is proclaimed offender.*
- 3. Stage of the trial/proceedings.*
- 4. Whether the compromise is genuine, voluntary and without any coercion or undue influence.*

To come up on 15.10.2025 for awaiting the report.

A copy of this order be sent to the learned trial Court/Illaq Magistrate, through electronic mode, for compliance.”

3. Pursuant to the aforesaid order, report dated 09.10.2025 from Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Patti has been received, which is taken on record. As per the report, the Trial Court has recorded as follows:-

“1. As per the statement of Investigating Officer ASI Harwinderpal Singh 950/T.T, petitioners and respondents there are five persons which are arrayed as accused in the present case.

2. As per the statement of Investigating Officer ASI Harwinderpal Singh 950/T.T and petitioners none of the accused is proclaimed offender in the present case.

3. As per the statement of Investigating Officer the challan in the present FIR has not been presented in the Court and the case is at the stage of investigation.

4. As per statement of the parties suffered which are on record, the compromise made by the parties appears to be genuine, voluntary and without any coercion or undue influence. The Copies of Adhar Card of petitioners are Mark C1 to Mark G1



and Copies of Adhar Cards of respondents are Mark A1 to Mark B1. ”

4. Learned counsel for respondent Nos.2 and 3 admits the fact of parties having compromised and states that he has no objection in case the FIR and all proceedings subsequent thereto against the petitioners are quashed.

5. Similarly, learned State counsel has stated no objection in case the FIR is quashed based upon the compromise (Annexure P-3).

6. I have heard learned Counsel for the parties and have carefully gone through the records of the case.

7. This Court and the Hon'ble Apex Court has repeatedly dealt with the issue of exercise of jurisdiction under Section 482 of the Code to quash proceeding in non-compoundable offences in the cases of ***Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab and another, 2012(10) SCC 303, Kulwinder Singh & others vs. State of Punjab & another, 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052 and Ram Gopal and another vs. State of Madhya Pradesh, 2021(4) R.C.R. (Criminal) 322 (Criminal Appeal No.1489 of 2012 decided on 29th of September, 2021)***. The proposition of law that emerges from the aforesaid decisions rendered by the Hon'ble Apex Court and this Court is :

- (a) Power u/s 482 Cr.P.C. vested with this Court is much wider and is unaffected by Section 320 of the Code.*
- (b) However, wider the power greater the caution.*
- (c) The underlining principle while exercising such power is that it can be invoked to quash the proceedings recognizing compromise between the parties in the matters which are overwhelmingly and predominantly of civil character like commercial*



transactions or arising out of matrimonial relationship or family disputes.

- (d) The said power is not to be exercised in the prosecutions involving heinous and serious offences of mental depravity or offences like murder, rape, dacoity etc. as such offences are not private in nature and have a serious impact on society.*
- (e) Section 482 Cr.P.C. casts duty upon the High Court to advance interest of justice as well. It is in recognition of this duty casted upon the High Court, that Apex Court held that the High Court would not refuse to quash FIR under Section 307 merely because FIR finds mention thereof. High Court can assess nature of injuries sustained, whether such injuries inflicted on vital/delicate parts of the body/nature of weapons used etc.*
- (f) Such exercise at the hands of High Court would be permissible only after the evidence is collected after investigation and chargesheet is filed/charges framed during the trial. Such exercise cannot be carried out while the matter is still under investigation.*
- (g) While quashing FIR in non-compoundable offences even which are of private in nature, High Court is required to consider antecedents of the accused, conduct of the accused and whether he was absconding or whether he has managed the complainant to enter into a compromise.*

The statutory provision of Section 528 of BNSS, 2023 is same as the statutory provision of Section 482 of Cr.P.C., 1973. Therefore, the above said principles of law would apply to a petition under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023 as well.



8. Thus, keeping in view the aforesaid facts and circumstances, this Court is of the considered opinion that it is a fit case to exercise jurisdiction vested u/s 528 of BNSS,2023 to quash the FIR as :-

- (i) *Putting a quietus to the proceedings will bring peace and tranquility amongst parties & will accordingly further the cause of substantial justice.*
- (ii) *The offences alleged are primarily of private nature.*
- (iii) *The parties have compromised.*
- (iv) *As per the report received the compromise is said to be voluntary in its nature.*
- (v) *Complainant/victim is reported to have entered into compromise on his own volition.*

9. Consequently, the petition is allowed. DDR No.20 dated 25.04.2020 under Sections 452, 323, 326, 506, 148, 149 of IPC 1860 (after that deleted Sections 452, 325, 326, 148, 149 of IPC and added Section 34 of IPC in FIR No.108 dated 24.04.2020 registered at Police Station Sadar Patti, District Tarn Taran and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 21.04.2025 (Annexure P-3), are, hereby, quashed qua the petitioners.

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

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

19.11.2025

jatin

Whether speaking/reasoned:
Whether reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No