

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

**CRM-M-42064-2024 (O&M)
Date of decision : 21.05.2025**

Biv Din @ Rabib Din and others

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU


Present:- Ms. Pooja, Advocate for
Mr. Ritesh Pandey, Advocate for the petitioners.

Ms. Manjot Kaur, AAG, Punjab for respondent No.1.

Mr. Aazam Khan, Advocate for respondent No.2.

MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU, J.

Present petition has been filed under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (*for short 'BNSS'*) for quashing of FIR No.40 dated 17.04.2024 (P-1), under Sections 326, 324, 323 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (*for short 'IPC'*), registered at Police Station Shri Hargobindpur, Police District Batala, District Gurdaspur along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the



basis of compromise dated 10.06.2024 (P-2), entered into between the parties i.e. petitioners as well as respondent No.2/*de facto* complainant.

(2) Allegations are that petitioners are the in-laws of *de facto* complainant-Janam and on 25.12.2023, in furtherance of their common intention, inflicted serious injuries to her with their respective weapons for not bringing dowry.

(3) Contends that matter has been amicably settled between the parties i.e. petitioners as well as respondent No.2; hence FIR in question as well as consequential proceedings deserve to be quashed.

(4) Learned Counsel for respondent No.2 has also acknowledged the contention raised on behalf of the petitioner.


(5) Still further, learned State Counsel, on instructions from the police official present, is not averse in case the above FIR along with consequential proceedings are quashed and set aside on the basis of the compromise entered into between the parties i.e. petitioner as well as respondent No.2.

(6) Heard learned Counsel for the parties and perused the paper-book.

(7) This Court, while issuing notice of motion on 05.03.2025, passed the following order:-

“Mr. Aazam Khan, Advocate has filed Power of Attorney on behalf of respondent No.2, which is taken on record. Registry to do the needful.

2025:PHHC:068389



(2) Contends, inter alia, that matter has been compromised between the parties i.e. petitioners and respondent No.2.

(3) It transpires that notice of motion has already been issued.

(4) Learned counsel for respondent No.2 acknowledged the factum of compromise (P-2) arrived at between the parties i.e. petitioners and respondent No.2.

(5) Petitioners shall file their respective affidavits that there is no other criminal case(s) pending against them and also give the details of any other FIR(s), already quashed on the basis of compromise.

(6) In view of the above, let parties appear before learned Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court on or before 17.03.2025, for recording their statement(s) with reference to the compromise, if any, entered into between them.

(7) Learned Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court shall record the statement(s) of all accused, complainant/injured and victim, if any, and submit a report to this Court before the next date of hearing containing the following information:-

(i). Whether the statements of the parties are bona fide and not result of any pressure or coercion etc. in any manner?


(ii). Whether the compromise effected between the parties is genuine and valid?

(iii). Whether all the accused, complainant and injured are party to the compromise and if not, the details/particulars of such person(s)?

(iv). Whether any other case is pending against either of the parties or not, if yes, the details thereof?

(v). Whether any of the persons involved in this case/dispute has been declared a proclaimed offender?

2025:PHHC:068389



(vi). Whether any of the petitioner(s) is/are previous convict or not?

(8) List before this Court on 27.03.2025 for further consideration.

(9) Meanwhile, learned State Counsel shall also get the instructions in the matter as to whether the State has any objection?

(10) Copy of this order be sent to learned Judicial Officer concerned forthwith for information and strict compliance.”

(8) In terms of aforesaid order, statements of both the parties were recorded and report dated 20.03.2025, received from learned Civil Judge (Junior Division)-cum-JMIC, Batala. For reference, the relevant extract of report reads as under:-


“Accordingly, the requisite report is being submitted as under:-

i). From the statements suffered by the parties, it seems that the statements of the parties are bona fide. It appears that the statements are not result of any pressure or coercion in any manner.

ii). From the statements suffered by the parties, it appears that compromise effected between the parties is genuine and valid.

iii). As per the statement of the complainant/respondent no. 2 Janam wife of Biv Din, the present FIR case was registered by her against Biv Din alias Rabib Din, Shah Din, Siya alias Sharif Din and Ghuki alias Shalo. She further stated that there was no other accused in the present case. She further stated that apart from her, there

2025:PHHC:068389



was no other victim/injured. Even, the Investigating Officer ASI Sakattar Singh stated that there was no other accused in the present FIR, and there was no other victim/injured. Hence, all the accused and complainant/injured are parties to the compromise.

iv). As per the statement of Investigating Officer ASI Sakattar Singh, no other case is pending against either of the parties.

v). As per the statement of Investigating Officer ASI Sakattar Singh, no persons involved in this case have been declared proclaimed offenders.

vi). As per the statement of Investigating Officer ASI Sakattar Singh, none of the petitioner/accused is a previous convict.”

A perusal of the aforesaid extract clearly reveals that matter has been compromised by both sides with their free consent, voluntarily and without any coercion or undue influence. Even before this Court also, there is no objection by either side against each other.


(9) Hon’ble the Supreme Court in “**Gian Singh Versus State of Punjab**”, (2012) 10 SCC 303, has held 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 FIR may be exercised where the offender and the 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 a serious impact on society. Similarly, any compromise between the victim and the offender in relation to the offences under special statutes like the 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 predominatingly 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 the 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

2025:PHHC:068389



secure the ends of justice, it is appropriate that the 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.”

(10) In view of above discussion, this Court is fully convinced that the offence is entirely personal in nature and does not affect public peace or tranquility. Thus, quashing of the FIR in question along with consequential proceedings, on the basis of compromise, would bring peace and harmony to secure the ends of justice.

(11) Consequently, present petition is allowed; aforesaid FIR along with all consequential proceedings resulting therefrom are quashed *qua* the petitioner(s).

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

21st May, 2025
Gagan

(MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No