



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

273

CRM-M-45092-2025

Date of decision: 17.09.2025

JAGDEEP SINGH

...PETITIONER

V/s

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Azam Khan, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Vishal Singh, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Anshul Khurana, Advocate for respondent No.2.

SUMEET GOEL, J.

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023 for quashing of FIR No.173 dated 12.06.2025 under Sections 506, 420, 406, 379 of IPC, registered at Police Station Saran District Faridabad Haryana and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 05.08.2025 (Annexure P-2), which is stated to have been effected between the parties.

2 On 20.08.2025, the following order was passed:

“The petitioner has 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 petitioner 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. Tarun Aggarwal, Addl.AG, Haryana has put in appearance on behalf of respondent No.1-State of Haryana and accepts notice.



Mr. Anshul Khurana, Advocate has filed memorandum of appearance for respondent No.2. The same be taken on record. 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 25.08.2025 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/Illaq 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. 17.09.2025."



3. Pursuant to the aforesaid order, report dated 27.08.2025 from Civil Judge (Jr. Divn)-cum-Judicial Magistrate, Ist Class, Faridabad, has been received, which is taken on record. As per the report, the Trial Court has recorded as follows:-

“i. In reference to the above cited subject, I have the honour to submit that in pursuance of Order dated 20.08.2025 passed by the Hon'ble High Court, the complainant Pardeep Kumar, the accused person, namely, Jagdeep Singh and Investigating Officer SI Ram Kumar (No. 1031/Faridabad) appeared before the under-signed and their statements have been recorded. The parties have relied upon their Aadhaar card for identification, copies of which are placed on record.

ii. The complainant, namely, Pardeep Kumar and the accused person, namely Jagdeep Singh suffered a statement to the effect that they have settled their dispute amicably with the intervention of elders and respectable persons of the society. They further stated that they have entered into a compromise with the complainant out of their sweet will, without any fear, coercion or pressure from anyone. The accused person has not been declared proclaimed offender/ person and no such proceedings are pending against him before any other competent court of law. He is not involved in any other case. Both sides were duly identified by their respective Counsels.

iii. The under-signed inquired from the parties about the factum of compromise to which they stated at bar, in consonance with their statements, that they have settled their dispute by entering into compromise which is acceptable to both of them. The said compromise has been effected voluntarily and without any pressure, with the intervention of respectable persons of society. They further stated that all their disputes have been put to rest and they have no grudge against each other. The complainant Pardeep Kumar further stated that he has no objection if the proceedings of this case qua the accused are quashed by the Hon'ble High Court.

iv. As per the statement of Investigating Officer SI Ram Kumar (No. 1031/Faridabad), P.S Saran, Faridabad, No PO/PP proceedings are pending against any of the parties. As per ICJS record, accused is not involved in any other case. As per the FIR, Pardeep Kumar is the complainant and Jagdeep Singh has been arrayed as an accused person. Furtherinore, there is no person other than the complainant, who is an aggrieved/affected party. There is no person other than Jagdeep Singh, who has been arrayed as an accused.

v. The under-signed is of the considered view that the compromise appears to be genuine and has been reached at voluntarily, without any pressure or undue influence between the complainant, namely, Pardeep Kumar and accused person, namely, Jagdeep Singh. Further, they have made their statements voluntarily and without any threat, inducement, coercion or undue influence. Hence, from the careful scrunity of material on record and upon reasonable inquiry from the parties in this regard, the compromise appears to be genuine and voluntary.



vi. Statements of the complainant Pardeep Kumar and accused person, namely, Jagdeep Singh and Investigating Officer SI Ram Kumar (No. 1031/Faridabad) are enclosed with the present report in compliance of Order of the Hon'ble High Court dated 20.08.2025."

4. Learned counsel for respondent No.2 admits the factum of parties having compromised and states that he has no objection in case the FIR and all proceedings subsequent thereto against the petitioner 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.*

The statutory provision of Section 528 of BNSS, 2023 is same as the statutory provision of Section 482 of Cr.P.C., 1973. Therefore, the above said principles of law would apply to a petition under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023 as well.

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.173 dated 12.06.2025 under Sections 506, 420, 406, 379 of IPC, registered at Police Station Saran District Faridabad Haryana and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 05.08.2025 (Annexure P-2), are, hereby, quashed qua the petitioner.
10. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

17.09.2025
jatin

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