



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-44393-2024
Date of Decision: 28.04.2025

HARPREET SINGH PARMAR AND ANOTHER
....Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS
....Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Saurav Kanojia, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Jasdeep Singh, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Lakshay Bector, Advocate for respondent Nos.2 & 3.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Instant petition has been filed under Section 528 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 482 Cr.P.C.), seeking quashing of the below detailed First Information Report (FIR), and all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of the compromise dated 11.03.2024 (Annexure P-2), effected between the parties.

DETAILS OF CRIMINAL CASE:-

FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station
134	29.05.2024	148, 149, 324, 341, 506 & 307 IPC	Rama Mandi District Police Commissionerate Jalandhar

2. Status report dated 27.04.2025, in the shape of affidavit of Amandeep Singh, PPS, Assistant Commissioner of Police, Central, Jalandhar, has been filed by learned State counsel in Court today, the same



is taken on record. Registry is directed to tag the same at appropriate place.

By referring to para Nos.10 and 11 of the status report dated 27.04.2025, learned DAG submits that injury suffered by injured Karanveer Singh (complainant/respondent No.2) was declared as simple in nature after CT scan examination.

It is further explained that the injury No.1 sustained by Rajinder Singh was though declared as grievous in nature after CT scan examination but same has never been declared dangerous to life till date.

Para Nos.10 and 11 of the status report are reproduced as under:-

- “10. That in compliance of order/direction of this Hon'ble Court as contained in the order dated 12.03.2025, the 10 moved an application to the Medical Officer Johal Hospital Jalandhar for obtaining the opinion about the injury suffered by Karanveer Singh (complainant/respondent No.2). As per Medical Opinion dated 29.05.2024 given by Dr. Amit Chaudhary, Johal Hospital, Jalandhar, injury No.1 sustained by Karanveer Singh/respondent No.2 was declared to be simple in nature after CT scan examination. A copy of the medical opinion of the doctor is attached herewith as Annexure R-3.*
- 11. That as per Medical Opinion dated 30.05.2024 given by Dr. Amit Chaudhary, Johal Hospital, Jalandhar, injury No.1 sustained by Rajinder Singh (injured/respondent No.3) was declared to be grievous in nature after CT scan examination and neurosurgery opinion. A copy of the medical opinion of the doctor is attached herewith as Annexure R4.”*

3. Referring to the aforementioned facts in the status report, counsel for the petitioners submits that though offence under Section 307 IPC has been mentioned in the case, however, looking at the opinion given by the doctors, it cannot be alleged that any offence, covered and punishable under Section 307 IPC has been committed.

Counsel further points out that in pursuance to the interim order dated 15.01.2025, the affected parties were directed to appear before

the learned Trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate, for getting their respective statements recorded with regard to the compromise. The Trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate was to submit a report in this regard giving certain details as enumerated in the said order.

4. Pursuant to the aforementioned order, the parties appeared before the Court of learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Jalandhar, and as per report dated 04.03.2025, submitted to this Court, both the parties have got recorded their respective statements in Court. From the report received from the learned Court below, the following is discernible:-

Sr. No.	Description	
1.	Total number of persons found involved as accused in the dispute/FIR	02
2.	Number of complainant/victim(s)	02
3.	Whether all the accused and complainant / victims are party to compromise & signed the same	yes
4.	In case, any affected person (accused or complainant) is left out or not arrayed as party in the quashing petition before High Court, detail whereof; OR	
	His/her statement is still to be recorded, in compliance to the direction of this Court, details of such person	
5.	Whether any accused has been declared as a proclaimed offender/person or any such proceedings against him/her have been initiated or pending adjudication	No
6.	Report of the Court whether compromise is genuine, voluntary, and without any coercion or undue influence	Yes

7.	Any other aspect relevant to the present case.	
----	--	--

5. At the very outset, learned counsels for the petitioners and the respondents, jointly state that all the accused and victims, including complainant are parties to the present quashing petition.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) submits that in view of the report received from the learned Court below, it is evident that the matter has been resolved and private parties have effected a compromise, and there remains no dispute amongst them requiring any adjudication. Further submits that in view of the compromise so effected between the private parties, pendency of the FIR and consequential proceedings emanating therefrom would be sheer abuse of the process of law, and the same may be quashed.

7. Learned State counsel as also learned counsel for private respondent(s), after going through the statements and the report received from learned Court below, very fairly admit that the private parties have resolved their dispute and effected a compromise and that they have no objection if the FIR (supra) and all the consequential proceedings are quashed on the basis of the compromise.

7. Through catena of judgments, Hon’ble the Apex Court and High Courts (including Punjab and Haryana High Court), have culled out various principles of law concerning quashing of proceedings emanating after lodging of FIR, and some of them are as under:-

- *Power under Section 482 Cr.P.C./Section 528 BNSS can be exercised to enhance social amity, and to reduce friction.*
- *Disputes which have their genesis in a matrimonial discord, landlord-tenant matters, commercial transactions and other such matters can safely be dealt with by the Court by exercising its powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C./Section 528 BNSS in the event of a compromise, but this is not to say that the power is limited to such cases.*
- *There can never be any hard and fast category which can be prescribed to enable the Court to exercise its power under Section 482 Cr.P.C./Section 528 BNSS "to prevent abuse of the process of any Court" or "to secure the ends of justice".*



- *No embargo, be in the shape of Section 320(9) Cr.P.C./Section 359 BNSS, or any other such curtailment, can whittle down the power under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C./Section 528 of the BNSS.*
- *The compromise, in a modern society, is the sine qua non of harmony and orderly behaviour.*
- *High Court has the wide power to quash the proceedings even in non-compoundable offences notwithstanding the bar under Section 320 Cr.P.C./Section 359 BNSS, in order to prevent the abuse of law and to secure the ends of justice.*
- *Power under Section 482 Cr.P.C./Section 528 BNSS is to be exercised Ex-Debita Justitia to prevent an abuse of process of Court.*
- *Such power has no limits. However, the High Court will exercise it sparingly and with utmost care and caution.*
- *The exercise of power has to be with circumspection and restraint.*
- *The Court is a vital and an extra-ordinary effective instrument to maintain and control social order.*
- *The Courts play role of paramount importance in achieving peace, harmony and ever-lasting congeniality in society.*
- *Resolution of a dispute by way of a compromise between two warring groups, therefore, should attract the immediate and prompt attention of a Court which should endeavour to give full effect to the same unless such compromise is abhorrent to lawful composition of the society or would promote savagery.*
- *Matters which can be categorized as personal in nature or where nature of injuries do not exhibit mental depravity or involves commission of an offence of such a serious nature that quashing of FIR would override the public interest, the Court can quash the FIR in view of the settlement arrived at amongst the parties.*

In this regard, judgments cited are:

1. **Gian Singh v. State of Punjab and another, (2012) 10 SCC 303 (SC);**
2. **Parbatbhai Aahir @ Parbatbhai Bhimsinhbhai Karmur and others v. State of Gujarat and another, (2017) 9 SCC 641 (SC);**
3. **Ramgopal and another v. State of Madhya Pradesh, 2021 SCC Online SC 834 (SC); and**
4. **Kulwinder Singh and others v. State of Punjab and another, 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052 [P&H FB]**

**CRM-M-44393-2024****6**

8. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and going through the material available on record, this Court finds that there appears to be substance in the submission of learned counsel for the petitioners that pendency of the present criminal litigation would be abuse of process of law since the chances of conviction of the petitioners are bleak in view of the compromise, so effected between the private parties.

9. The report alongwith statements of the affected parties received from learned Court below would reveal that the complainant/victim person(s) have genuinely effected a compromise with the petitioners and they have no objection, if the impugned FIR and consequential proceedings are quashed.

10. Keeping in view the totality of the facts and circumstances of the case, including the report received by this Court and also, taking into consideration the aforementioned settled principles of law, this petition is accepted and FIR (as detailed in para No. 1 above) and all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom are hereby quashed *qua* the petitioners, in view of compromise dated 11.03.2024 (Annexure P-2).

11. Petition stands disposed of.

April 28, 2025
Sangeeta

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking:
Whether reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No