



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

113**CRM-M-44963-2024**

Date of Decision: 18.03.2025

Pancham @ Pancham Wraich

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

....Respondents

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Vikrant K. Vij, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gurpartap S. Bhullar, Asst. AG, Punjab.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

The petitioner who claims that respondent No.4 had deceived this Court by highlighting forged compromise deed, has come up before this Court by filing the present petition under Section 379 BNSS 2023.

2. I have heard counsel for the petitioner to ascertain that whether the matter is worth issuing notice or not and its analysis would lead to the following outcome.

3. I have perused the Annexure P-2 i.e. order dated 11.01.2024 passed by Coordinate Bench of this Court in CRM-M-1372-2024, which reads as under:-

"This is a petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of FIR No.183, dated 16.09.2022 (Annexure P-1), under Sections 379-B, 354, 323, 506, 34 and 120-B of the IPC, 1860 and Sections 67 and 67(A) of IT Act, 2000 (Sections 379-B, 354, 323, 34 and 120-B of IPC deleted later on and Sections 294 of IPC added later on) registered at Police Station Sadar Ludhiana, District Police Commissionerate Ludhiana, Punjab with all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise dated 04.01.2024 (Annexure P-2).

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Anmol Singh Sandhu, AAG Punjab accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1-State.

Mr. Saurabh Singla, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of respondent No.2 and has filed Vakalatnama. He admits the factum of compromise entered into between the parties. List on 06.03.2024.

In the meantime, the parties are directed to appear before the Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court within a period of two weeks from today, for recording of their statements with regard to the compromise.

The trial Court is directed to submit a report on or before the next date of hearing containing the following information:-

- (i) Number of persons arrayed as accused in the FIR;*
- (ii) Whether any accused is declared as proclaimed offender?*
- (iii) Whether the compromise is genuine, voluntary and without any coercion or undue influence?*
- (iv) Whether the accused persons are involved in any other FIR or not?*

4. Counsel for the petitioner submits that after passing of the above said order, the said petition was withdrawn on 22.08.2024, when it come to the notice of respondent No.4 that petitioner is proceeding against him. It would be appropriate to reproduce the relevant portion of the order dated 22.08.2024, which reads as follows:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner prays for withdrawal of the instant petition as the parties have resiled from the terms of the compromise.

Allowed as prayed for.

Dismissed as withdrawn.”

5. Private respondent(s) did not get any actual benefit, therefore this is not an appropriate case for this Court to proceed under Section 379 BNSS 2023. However there is clearly mentioned in the order dated 22.08.2024 that parties have resiled from the compromise.

6. Given above, the present petition is dismissed. Pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

18.03.2025
anju rani

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether reportable?	No