

2025:PHHC:056267



351 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-33534-2024
Date of Decision: 29.04.2025

Sandeep Singh and others ...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. DPS Joura, Advocate for
Mr. S.S. Dhillon, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Ravinder Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Tarun Seth, Advocate for
Mr. Vikas Bishnoi, Advocate
for respondent Nos.2 to 4.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)

1. Instant petition has been filed praying for quashing of FIR No.08 dated 02.02.2024, under Sections 323, 324, 148, 149, 325, 326 IPC (Sections 325 and 326 IPC added later on vide DDR No.15 dated 24.03.2024) registered at Police Station Bariwala, District Sri Muktsar Sahib (Annexure P-1) and quashing of DDR No.21 dated 05.02.2024, registered at Police Station Bariwala, District Sri Muktsar Sahib (Annexure P-2) and all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise (Annexure P-3).

2. FIR in question was got registered by complainant-respondent No.2 and the investigation commenced thereon. However, with the intervention of respectables, finally the parties arrived at settlement and they resolved their inter se dispute, which is apparent from Compromise, annexed as Annexure P-3. On the basis of the compromise, the petitioners are invoking

the inherent power of this Court by praying that continuation of these proceedings would be a futile exercise and an abuse of process of the Court and thus, the FIR in question and all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom may be quashed in the interest of justice.

3. This Court vide order dated 16.07.2024/05.08.2024 directed the parties to appear before the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate for recording their statements, as contended before the Court, and the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate was also directed to send its report.

4. In pursuance to the same, learned JMIC, Sri Muktsar Sahib has sent the report dated 27.09.2024/21.04.2025 to this Court. With the report learned JMIC, Sri Muktsar Sahib has also annexed the original joint statement of respondent No.2-complainant namely, Jaspreet Singh; respondent No.3-injured Jagmeet Singh; respondent No.4-injured Harpreet Singh; joint statement of petitioner No.1; Sandeep Singh; petitioner No.2-Gurpreet Singh @ Gabbar @ Gopi; petitioner No.3-Amandeep Singh; petitioner No.4-Babbu Singh @ Sandeep Singh; petitioner No.5-Satpal Singh @ Satnam Singh; petitioner No.6-Harpreet Singh @ Kashi; petitioner No.7-Jaspreet Singh @ Laddi; petitioner No.8-Indjerjit Singh (recorded subsequently on 18.02.2025); petitioner No.9-Guri @ Gurvir Singh; petitioner No.10-Karanveer Singh @ Rubal; petitioner No.11-Udeyveer Singh @ Udey Singh; petitioner No.12-Davinder Pal @ Davinder Singh; petitioner No.13 Jashan Chatha @ Jashanpreet Singh recorded on 03.09.2024 and statement of HC, Lakhvir Singh, recorded on 25.09.2024. On the basis of the statements, learned JMIC, Sri Muktsar Sahib has concluded in the report that the compromise effected between the parties is genuine, voluntary, without any coercion, undue influence, fraud or misrepresentation. It has been further mentioned in the report that as per the statement of IO, seven petitioners namely petitioner No.1;

Sandeep Singh; petitioner No.2-Gurpreet Singh @ Gabbar @ Gopi; petitioner No.5-Satpal Singh @ Satnam Singh; petitioner No.7-Jaspreet Singh @ Laddi; petitioner No.8-Inderjit Singh; petitioner No.10-Karanveer Singh @ Rubal and petitioner No.12-Davinder Pal @ Davinder Singh are involved in other cases under IPC, NDPS Act and Arms Act. Except them, no other petitioners are involved in any other case. Further, it is also mentioned in the statement that complainant in the present case namely Jaspreet Singh-respondent No.2 is involved in one case as well as complainant-Jagmeet Singh @ Jugnu-respondent No.3 in DDR No.21 dated 05.02.2024 is involved in other six cases under the NDPS Act and IPC. None of the accused was declared proclaimed offender in the present case.

Further, it is inadvertently mentioned in the report dated 21.04.2025 that complainants-respondents have not appeared before the JMIC, Sri Muktsar Sahib for recording their statements, as perusal of the earlier report dated 27.09.2024 reveals that complainants-respondents had already appeared and got recorded their statements regarding compromise with all the accused-petitioners. Further, the name of petitioner No.8 Inderjit Singh at the time of recording of his statement dated 18.02.2025 has been inadvertently mentioned as complainant-Inderjit Singh instead of accused-petitioner-Inderjit Singh. Accordingly, the same are corrected hereby.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties, perused the record and the report sent by the learned JMIC, Sri Muktsar Sahib.

6. A bare perusal of statutory provision of the 528 of BNSS would show that the High Court may make such orders, as may be necessary to give effect to any order under this Code or to prevent abuse of the process of any Court or otherwise to secure the ends of justice. Section 359 BNSS is equally relevant for consideration, which prescribes the procedure for compounding of

the offences under the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.

7. Keeping in view the nature of offences allegedly committed and the fact that both the parties have amicably settled their dispute, the continuation of criminal prosecution would be a futile exercise. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in a number of cases including ***Narinder Singh and others Versus State of Punjab and another, 2014 (6) SCC 466***; ***B.S.Joshi and others vs State of Haryana and another (2003) 4 Supreme Court Cases 675*** followed by this Court in Full Bench case of ***Kulwinder Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and another, 2007(3) RCR 1052*** have dealt with the proposition involved in the present case and settled the law.

8. Thereafter, Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Gian Singh vs State of Punjab and another (2012) 10 Supreme Court Cases 303*** further dealt with the issue and the earlier law settled by the Supreme Court for quashing of the FIR in ***State of Haryana vs Bhajan Lal, 1992 Supp (1) SCC 335***. Para 61 of the judgment reads 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 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-dominatingly 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 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 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.”

9. Applying the law settled by Hon'ble Supreme Court in plethora of judgments and this High Court, it is apparent that when the parties have entered into a compromise, then continuation of the proceedings would be

merely an abuse of process of the Court and by allowing and accepting the prayer of the petitioners by quashing the FIR would be securing the ends of justice, which is primarily the object of the legislature enacting under Section 528 of BNSS.

10. Although present case pertains to an offence under Section 326 IPC yet good sense has prevailed upon the parties and they have settled the dispute and this Court accepts the settlement just to enhance the spirit of brotherhood, peace and harmony between the parties.

11. As a result, this Court finds that the case in hand squarely falls within the ambit and parameters settled by judicial precedents and hence, FIR No.08 dated 02.02.2024, under Sections 323, 324, 148, 149, 325, 326 IPC (Sections 325 and 326 IPC added later on vide DDR No.15 dated 24.03.2024) registered at Police Station Bariwala, District Sri Muktsar Sahib (Annexure P-1) and quashing of DDR No.21 dated 05.02.2024, registered at Police Station Bariwala, District Sri Muktsar Sahib (Annexure P-2), along with all other consequential proceedings arising therefrom are hereby quashed *qua* the petitioners on the basis of compromise. Needless to say that the parties shall remain bound by the terms and conditions of the compromise and their statements recorded before the Court below.

12. Petition stands allowed.

29.04.2025
Parveen kumar

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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