



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

288

(1) CRM-M-31444-2025

PARDEEP KAUR AND ANOTHER

....PETITIONERS

V/s

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER

....RESPONDENTS

(2) CRM-M-51100-2025

PARDEEP KAUR AND ANOTHER

....PETITIONERS

V/s

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER

....RESPONDENTS

Date of decision: 12.11.2025

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Naveen Sharma, Advocate for the petitioners.

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

Mr. S. S. Gill, Advocate for respondent No.2.

SUMEET GOEL, J.

1. By this common order, the aforesaid two petitions i.e. CRM-M-31444 and CRM-M-51100-2025, are being disposed off together.

The first petition bearing CRM-M-31444-2025 has been filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. for quashing of FIR No.25 dated 22.02.2020 under Sections 323, 324, 34 of IPC, registered at Police Station Payal, District Ludhiana and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 12.03.2025 (Annexure P-2), which is stated to



have been effected between the parties. Second petition bearing CRM-M-51100-2025 has been filed seeking quashing of the impugned order dated 01.12.2022 passed by learned Sub-Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Payal, whereby the petitioners have been declared as proclaimed offender

2. On 23.09.2025, the following order was passed in the first petition:

“The petitioners have approached this Court seeking quashing of FIR (Annexure P-1) and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom on the basis of a compromise having been effected between the parties. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that all concerned are parties to the present petition in terms of the dicta of the Division Bench judgment of this Court passed in ‘Rakesh Das Vs. State of Haryana and another’, Neutral Citation: 2024:PHHC;147654-DB.

Notice of motion.

At this stage, Mr. Amit Kumar Goyal, Addl. AG, Punjab has put in appearance on behalf of respondent No.1-State of Punjab and accepts notice.

Mr. P.S. Chahal, Advocate has caused appearance on behalf of respondent No.2. He seeks and is permitted time to file his power of attorney.

The parties are directed to get their statements recorded qua the factum of compromise in the following manner:

(i) The parties shall appear before the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate concerned on 01.10.2025 or any date thereafter as fixed by trial Court/Illaq Magistrate for recording statements of the petitioner as well as of the complainant qua the factum of compromise. As and when any such appearance is made, the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate shall do the needful for recording the statements of the parties qua the factum of the compromise. It shall be open to the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate to either record the statements of the parties by physical process or by video conferencing as deemed appropriate by the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate.

(ii) In case the statement is to be recorded by way of video conferencing, the parties concerned shall be duly identified through video conferencing by their respective counsel, subject to the satisfaction of the Presiding Officer.

(iii) The trial Court/Illaq Magistrate may also choose to get the statements of the parties recorded through some Commissioner, appointed by the Court who would be some Advocate having sufficient standing at the Bar. In case the statement is recorded through some Commissioner, such Commissioner/Advocate shall furnish an affidavit after recording statements to the effect that the parties had appeared before him/her and he/she had recorded their statements as per law and that the said parties had been duly identified by their respective counsel. This shall be subject to satisfaction of trial Court/Illaq Magistrate.

After recording the statements of all the affected parties in either of the aforesaid manner, the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate shall submit its report on the basis of the statements so recorded as to whether all the affected parties have entered into a compromise and as to 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 trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate shall also report as regards the following facts after seeking information from Investigating Officer, concerned:

(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?

The report be submitted before this Court before the next date of hearing i.e. 29.10.2025.

The petitioners are directed to deposit a sum of ₹30,000/- as costs with the High Court Lawyers Welfare Fund, Bank details whereof reads thus:

Account No.65018692589;

IFSC Code: SBIN0050306;

Branch Code: 50306;

Bank: State Bank of India, High Court Branch, Chandigarh

Payment of costs and production of receipt thereof shall be a condition precedent for recording of statements in the manner directed for hereinabove.”

3. Pursuant to the aforesaid order, report dated 27.10.2025 from Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Payal has been received, which is taken on record. As per the report, the Trial Court has recorded as follows:-

“(i) That there is no other accused other than the petitioners (namely Kuldeep Singh and Pardeep Kaur), arrayed in this petition.

(ii) As per the statement of HC Gagandeep Singh, there is no other complainant or affected/ aggrieved party other than the respondent (namely Udham Singh), arrayed in the petition.

(iii) As per the statement of HC Gagandeep Singh, both accused persons namely Kuldeep Singh and Pardeep Kaur were declared proclaimed offender in the present case on 01.12.2022 and after that accused Kuldeep Singh was arrested and granted the bail from the Hon'ble Court.

(iv) From the statements recorded in the court with regard to compromise, I am of the view that the compromise between the parties appeared before court, is genuine, voluntary and without any coercive or undue influence.”

4. Learned counsel for respondent No.2 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-2).

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.*

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 482 of Cr.P.C. 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. In view of the prevenient ratiocination, it is ordained thus:

- (i) CRM-M-31444-2025 is allowed. FIR No.25 dated 22.02.2020 under Sections 323, 324, 34 of IPC, registered at Police Station Payal, District Ludhiana and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 12.03.2025 (Annexure P-2), are, hereby, quashed qua the petitioners.



(ii) Since the FIR in question itself stands quashed on the basis of compromise, connected petition bearing CRM-M No.51100 of 2025 filed for seeking quashing of the impugned order dated 01.12.2022 passed by learned Sub-Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Payal, whereby the petitioners have been declared as proclaimed offender, stands allowed and consequently the impugned order dated 01.12.2022 is quashed and set aside.

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

(iv) No order as to costs.

(v) Photocopy of this order be placed on the file of other connected matter.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

12.11.2025
jatin

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