



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

237

CRM-M-46789-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 21.11.2025.

RAVI SINGH**...Petitioner(s)****VERSUS****STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS****...Respondent(s)****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ**

Present :- Ms. Sangeeta Devi, Advocate for
Mr. Ranbir Singh Sekhon, Advocate, for the petitioners.

Ms. Savi Nagpal, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. B.S.Aulakh Advocate
for Mr. A.P.S.Virk, Advocate for respondent Nos.2 and 3.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

Jurisdiction of this Court, has been invoked under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, for seeking quashing of FIR No.86 dated 16.06.2024 under Section 336 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 & Section 25 of Arms Act, 1959 registered at Police Station Shahkot, District Jalandhar alongwith all other consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise dated 21.10.2024 (Annexure P-2) entered between the parties.

2. The aforesaid FIR was registered on the statement of Sohan Lal who stated that he is a resident of Village Mienwal Moulvian, Police Station Shahkot, District Jalandhar Rural. He was previously employed as a driver



but now remains at home owing to his advancing age. He has six children including four daughters and two sons. His elder son, Krishan Kumar @ Kishan, resides with him. On 16.06.2024, at around 3:00 p.m., Sohan Lal had gone to Shahkot Rice Mill near Village Mienwal Moulvian. His son, Krishan Kumar @ Kishan, accompanied by his minor son Neev aged about 5–6 years, also reached the spot while moving around in the vicinity. As the child felt thirsty, Krishan Kumar @ Kishan knocked at the gate of the rice mill and entered inside with his son. Sohan Lal stated that some verbal altercation ensued between his son and the security guard of Shahkot Rice Mill, namely Ravi Singh, son of Jaswant Singh, resident of Budanwal, Shahkot. In the heat of the argument, Ravi Singh allegedly fired a shot from his 12-bore double-barrel gun towards the ground. Due to the negligent discharge of the firearm, pellets ricocheted and struck Krishan Kumar on his left leg, causing injuries. Thereafter, Sohan Lal's nephew, Arshdeep Gill @ Arsh, arranged for a vehicle and got the injured Krishan Kumar admitted to Kamal Hospital, Nakodar, where he is presently under treatment. Sohan Lal requested that appropriate legal action be taken against Ravi Singh.

3. On the basis of the aforesaid statement the instant FIR was registered.

4. However, on 21.10.2024, the parties compromised the matter and filed the present petition for seeking quashing of FIR on the basis of compromise.

5. The parties were directed to appear before the learned trial Court/Illaq Magistrate vide order dated 26.08.2025 of this Court, to get



their statements recorded regarding the compromise arrived at between the parties and a report in this regard was called for.

6. Pursuant to the said order, report has been received from the Judicial Magistrate First Class, Nakodar, vide Memo No.452-GIII dated 24.09.2025. The relevant extract of the report is reproduced as under:-

“As per the directions of the Hon’ble High Court following information is provided.

- 1. Only one person is arraigned as accused namely Ravi Kumar @ Singh in the present petition and there is no other accused.*
- 2. Apart from complainant Sohan Lal, Krishan Kumar @ Kishan is victim/injured in the present petition.*
- 3. All the accused, complainant and victim namely Ravi Kumar @ Singh, Sohan Lal and Krishan Kumar @ Kishan are party to compromise and signed the same.*
- 4. No affected person (accused or complainant) is left out or not arrayed as party in the quashing petition before Hon'ble High Court.*
- 5. No accused has been declared Proclaimed Offender/person in the present case.*
- 6. As per statement suffered by the parties and compromise placed on record, the compromise is genuine, voluntary and without any coercion or undue influence.*
- 7. No other aspect is relevant to the case.”*

7. Learned State counsel does not dispute the factum of the compromise amongst the parties and does not have any serious objection to the resolution of the dispute amongst the parties.

8. Mr. B.S. Aulakh, Advocate for Mr. A.P.S. Virk, Advocate appears for respondent Nos. 2 and 3 and reiterates the settlement and his con-



currence to the FIR and all the other consequential proceedings being quashed.

9. The broad principles for exercising the powers under Section 482, Cr.P.C (now Section 528 BNSS) were summarized by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of ***“Parbatbhai Aahir @ Parbatbhai Bhim-sinhbhai Karmur and others versus State of Gujarat and another”***(2017) 9 ***SCC 641***. The relevant paragraphs are extracted as under:

16.1. Section 482 preserves the inherent powers of the High Court to prevent an abuse of the process of any court or to secure the ends of justice. The provision does not confer new powers. It only recognises and preserves powers which inhere in the High Court.

16.2. The invocation of the jurisdiction of the High Court to quash a first information report or a criminal proceeding on the ground that a settlement has been arrived at between the offender and the victim is not the same as the invocation of jurisdiction for the purpose of compounding an offence. While compounding an offence, the power of the court is governed by the provisions of Section 320 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973. The power to quash under Section 482 is attracted even if the offence is non-compoundable.

16.3. In forming an opinion whether a criminal proceeding or complaint should be quashed in exercise of its jurisdiction under Section 482, the High Court must evaluate whether the ends of justice would justify the exercise of the inherent power.



16.4. While the inherent power of the High Court has a wide ambit and plenitude it has to be exercised (i) to secure the ends of justice, or (ii) to prevent an abuse of the process of any court.

16.5. The decision as to whether a complaint or first information report should be quashed on the ground that the offender and victim have settled the dispute, revolves ultimately on the facts and circumstances of each case and no exhaustive elaboration of principles can be formulated.

16.6. In the exercise of the power under Section 482 and while dealing with a plea that the dispute has been settled, the High Court must have due regard to the nature and gravity of the offence. Heinous and serious offences involving mental depravity or offences such as murder, rape and dacoity cannot appropriately be quashed though the victim or the family of the victim have settled the dispute. Such offences are, truly speaking, not private in nature but have a serious impact upon society. The decision to continue with the trial in such cases is founded on the overriding element of public interest in punishing persons for serious offences.

16.7. As distinguished from serious offences, there may be criminal cases which have an overwhelming or predominant element of a civil dispute. They stand on a distinct footing insofar as the exercise of the inherent power to quash is concerned.

16.8. Criminal cases involving offences which arise from commercial, financial, mercantile, partnership or similar transac-



tions with an essentially civil flavour may in appropriate situations fall for quashing where parties have settled the dispute.

16.9. In such a case, the High Court may quash the criminal proceeding if in view of the compromise between the disputants, the possibility of a conviction is remote and the continuation of a criminal proceeding would cause oppression and prejudice; and

16.10. There is yet an exception to the principle set out in propositions 16.8. and 16.9. above. Economic offences involving the financial and economic well-being of the State have implications which lie beyond the domain of a mere dispute between private disputants. The High Court would be justified in declining to quash where the offender is involved in an activity akin to a financial or economic fraud or misdemeanour. The consequences of the act complained of upon the financial or economic system will weigh in the balance.

10. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has held in '**Ramgopal And Another Vs State of Madhya Pradesh, 2021 SCC Online SC 834**', that the matters which can be categorized as personal in nature or in the matter in which the nature of injuries do not exhibit mental depravity or commission of an offence of such a serious nature that quashing of which would override public interest, the Court can quash the FIR in view of the settlement arrived at amongst the parties.

11. It is evident that in view of the amicable resolution of the issues amongst the parties, no useful purpose would be served by continuation of



the proceedings. The furtherance of the proceedings is likely to be a waste of judicial time and there appears to be no chances of conviction.

12. The following relevant factors emerge from perusal of the case as well as the subsequent developments supplementing a case for invocation of the powers under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023:-

- (i)The petitioner is 32 years old and continuation of criminal proceedings will cause severe repercussions to the petitioners in discharge of his social obligations as well as his career prospects.
- (ii)The petitioner is not involved in any other criminal case. The dispute arose on account of heated exchange of words and at the spur of the moment.
- (iii)The FIR in question pertains to the year 2024 and trial is still at initial stage. Out of total 12 prosecution witnesses, none have been examined so far. Putting an end to the proceedings will bring peace and tranquility among the parties.
- (iv)The offence in question cannot be said to be heinous or as an offence that would be shocking to the conscience of the society or public at large. It can also not be termed as one shocking to the conscience of the Court;
- (v)Continuation of the proceedings with the complainant unlikely to support the case of the prosecution, would serve no larger public purpose and only result in futile waste of judicial time.



13. In view of the report of the Judicial Magistrate First Class, Nankodar and the principles laid down by the Apex Court in '*Parbatbhai Aahir @ Parbatbhai Bhimsinhbhai Karmur and others versus State of Gujarat and another (2017) 9 SCC 641*', the instant petition is allowed. The aforesaid FIR and all other consequential proceedings arising therefrom, are hereby quashed qua the petitioner(s) in view of compromise dated 21.10.2024 (Annexure P-2) entered between the parties. However, the same would be subject to payment of costs of Rs.20,000/- to be deposited by the petitioner with the DHFWS SKS USERFEES CS OFFICE, Panchkula, Account No.50100189689492, IFSC Code HDFC0004832, HDFC BANK, Sector 6, Panchkula, within a period of two months from receipt of certified copy of this order.

14. Petition is allowed.

21.11.2025
monika

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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