



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

140

CRM-M-44659-2024

Date of decision: 23.07.2025

DAYA RAM AND ORS

...PETITIONERS

V/s

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. N.K. Ganga, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Tarun Aggarwal, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Abhinav Singla, Advocate for

Mr. Ajit Singh, Advocate for respondent Nos.2 to 7.

SUMEET GOEL, J.

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. with the prayer for quashing of FIR No.146 dated 16.06.2024 under Sections 147, 148, 149, 308, 323, 506 of IPC, 1860 (Section 307 IPC added and Section 308 IPC deleted later on) registered at Police Station Nathu Sarai Chopta, District Sirsa and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 21.08.2024 (Annexure P-2), which is stated to have been effected between the parties.

2. On 21.03.2025, the following order was passed:

“Contends that during investigation police has deleted offence under Section 308 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short ‘IPC’) and Section 307 of IPC added later on. Further contends that matter has been compromised between the parties i.e. petitioners as well as respondent Nos. 2 to 7.

(2) Notice of motion.

(3) Mr. Kiran Pal Singh, learned AAG, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1.

(4) Mr. A.K. Sharma, Advocate has filed Vakalatnama on behalf of respondent Nos.2 to 7. The same is taken on record. He acknowledged the factum of compromise (P-2) arrived at between the parties i.e. petitioners as well as respondent Nos. 2 to 7.



(5) Requisite number of copies of the petition be supplied to learned Counsel for the respondents during the course of day. (6) 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.

(7) In view of the above, let parties appear before the Court of learned Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court on or before 08.04.2025 for recording their statement(s) with reference to the compromise, if any, entered into between them.

(8) 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?

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

(9) List before this Court on 01.05.2025 for further consideration.

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

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

(12) Be shown in the Urgent list.”

3. Pursuant to the aforesaid order, report dated 21.05.2025 from Additional District & Sessions Judge, Sirsa has been received, which is taken on record. As per the report, the Trial Court has recorded as follows:-

“Both the parties i.e. four accused persons as well as complainant alongwith with five more eye witnesses/injured remained present on 14.05.2023 in the court of undersigned alongwith their respective counsels. Tara Chand is complainant and Mahabir, Inder, Satbir alias Gandhi, Anil Kumar, and Parhlad are the eye witnesses in this case. Their separate statements has been recorded under instruction and dictation of this court. They have stated that they have entered into a compromise with the accused persons with the intervention of Panahayat. The compromise is arrived among them without any pressure, coercion and inducement and they entered into compromise with free consent of every one. No any other case was ever registered or is pending against them. They are not even previous convict.

Similarly is the separate statements of four the accused persons namely Daya Ram, Santosh Devi, Vikram, Vinod has been recorded. They have stated that they have entered into a compromise with the complainant party with the intervention of Panahayat. The compromise is arrived among them without any pressure, coercion and inducement and they entered into compromise with free consent of every one. No any other case ever registered or is pending against them. They are not even previous convict.



Accused have also placed receipt of SBI Bank of Rs.25,000/- of dated 14.05.2025 deposited in the account No.37167209613.

Vide order dated 24.03.2023, the Hon'ble High Court sought the following information from the trial court which is replied:-

The statements of the parties are bona fide and not result of any pressure or coercion etc. in any manner. The compromise effected among the parties is genuine and valid. All the accused, complainant and injured are party to the compromise. No other case is pending against either of the parties. No person involved in this case declared proclaimed offender at any point of time. No accused person is previously convicted."

4. Learned counsel for respondent Nos.2 to 7 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 528 of BNSS,2023 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. Consequently, the petition is allowed. FIR No.146 dated 16.06.2024 under Sections 147, 148, 149, 308, 323, 506 of IPC, 1860 (Section 307 IPC added and Section 308 IPC deleted later on) registered at Police Station Nathu Sarai Chopta, District Sirsa and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 21.08.2024 (Annexure P-2), are, hereby, quashed qua the petitioners.

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

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

July 23, 2025
jatin

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