



275

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

CRM-M-29184-2023 (O&M)

Date of Decision : 09.09.2025

Pran Nath Rana @ Ghuli and others

....Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE RAMESH KUMARI

Present: Mr. Ravi Singh, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Baljinder Singh Sran, Addl.A.G, Punjab.

Mr. Jaspreet Singh Brar, Advocate for respondents No.2 to 5

-.-

RAMESH KUMARI, J. (Oral)

CRM-30714-2025

The present application has been filed for placing on record the original affidavit of the complainant in support of the compromise.

For the reasons mentioned in the application, which is duly supported by an affidavit, the same is allowed and original affidavit is ordered to be taken on record.

CRM-M-29184-2023

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 528 of the BNSS for quashing of FIR No.0048 dated 25.03.2025, registered under Sections 115(2), 118(1), 191(3), 190, 333 BNS, 2023, at Police Station Mullanpur, District SAS Nagar, Mohali and all subsequent proceedings



arising out of the said FIR, on the basis of compromise dated 20.08.2025 (Annexure P-2).

2. Pursuant to the order dated 08.08.2025, a report dated 29.08.2025 of the Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Kharar, has been received by this Court wherein it has been stated that the statements of the parties have been recorded and the parties have stated that they have compromised the matter voluntarily without any threat, pressure, undue influence or fraud and that the private respondents have no objection to the quashing of the present FIR. Joint statements of the parties have also been appended with the report.

3. The Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab & Anr. [2012 (10) SCC 303]** has held as under :

“57. 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 F.I.R may be exercised where the offender and 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 serious impact on society. Similarly, any compromise between the victim and offender in relation to the offences under special statutes like 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 pre-dominantly civil flavour stand on 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, High Court may quash criminal proceedings if in its view, because of the compromise between the offender and victim, the possibility of conviction is remote and bleak and continuation of criminal case would put 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 wrongdoer and whether to secure the ends of justice, it is appropriate that criminal case is put to an end and if the answer to the above question(s) is in affirmative, the High Court shall be



well within its jurisdiction to quash the criminal proceeding.”

4. In view of the above and keeping in view the report by the Trial Court that the parties have genuinely entered into a compromise and all the disputes between the parties have been resolved, it would not be in the interest of justice to continue with the criminal proceedings.

5. Resultantly, FIR No.0048 dated 25.03.2025, registered under Sections 115(2), 118(1), 191(3), 190, 333 BNS, 2023, at Police Station SAS Nagar, Mohali , including all subsequent proceedings arising out of the said FIR, on the basis of compromise dated 20.05.2025 (Annexure P-2), is quashed qua the petitioners only.

6. The petition is accordingly ***allowed***.

7. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

September 09, 2025
sonia arora

(RAMESH KUMARI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/non-speaking : Speaking
Whether reportable : Yes/No