



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

147

CRM-M-47104-2025

Date of decision: 22.09.2025

MANPREET SINGH AND ANOTHER

...PETITIONERS

V/s

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Prince Goyal, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Amit Kumar Goyal, Additional A.G. Punjab.

Mr. Vishwjeet Singh Rana, Advocate
for respondents No.2 and 3.

SUMEET GOEL, J.

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023 for quashing of FIR No.0013 dated 07.02.2018 under Sections 447, 506, 511, 148, 149, 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, 1959 (Section 120-B of IPC, 1860, and Sections 25, 27 of the Arms Act, 1959 deleted later-on), registered at Police Station City Rampura, District Bathinda and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 14.08.2025 (Annexure P-10), which is stated to have been effected between the parties.

2. On 28.08.2025, the following order was passed:

“The petitioners have 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 petitioners 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- B.

Notice of motion.

At this stage, Mr. Kunwarbir Singh, AAG, Punjab has put in appearance on behalf of respondent No.1-State of Punjab and accepts notice.

Mr. Ritesh Singla, Advocate has filed vakalatnama for respondent Nos.2 & 3. 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/Illaqa Magistrate concerned on 30.08.2025 or any date thereafter as fixed by trial Court/Illaqa 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/Illaqa 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/Illaqa Magistrate to either record the statements of the parties by physical process or by video conferencing as deemed appropriate by the trial Court/Illaqa 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/Illaqa 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/Illaqa Magistrate.

After recording the statements of all the affected parties in either of the aforesaid manner, the trial Court/Illaqa 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/Illaqa 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. 18.09.2025.”

3. Pursuant to the aforesaid order, report dated 12.09.2025 from Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Phul has been received, which is taken on record. As per the report, the Trial Court has recorded as follows:-

“1. It is humbly submitted that as per the statements of parties and ASI Jagdev Singh No.1412/BTI, FIR No.13 dated 07.02.2018 under Sections 447/506/511/148/149/120B of IPC and 25/27 of Arms Act (offence under Sections 120-B of IPC and 25/27 of Arms Act deleted later on) was registered at PS City Rampura, District Bathinda against accused Major Singh s/o Harnek Singh, Nazar Singh @ Lodha s/o Harnek Singh, Harjinder Singh s/o Amarjeet Singh, Ruldu Singh s/o Gurcharan Singh, Palwinder Singh @ Baggi s/o Harbans Singh, Gurtej Singh s/o Dalip Singh, all residents of Poohli, Sub Tehsil Nathana, District Bathinda, Gurwinder Singh s/o Amarjeet Singh, Karam Singh s/o Gurdev Singh, Harveer Singh s/o Gurdev Singh, Mandeep Singh s/o Jaswinder Singh, all residents of Poohli, District Bathinda, Jaswinder Singh son of Amarjit Singh resident of Poohli, District Bathinda, Manpreet Singh son of Karam Singh and Iqbal Singh son of Harvir Singh, both residents of village Phooli, District Bathinda However, accused Major Singh, Nazar Singh, Harjinder Singh. Palwinder Singh @ Baggi, Gurtej Singh, Gurwinder Singh, Karam Singh, Harveer Singh and Mandeep Singh have already been acquitted vide judgment dated 06.03.2025 passed by Ms. Mamta Kakkar, the then Learned Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate. Phul and accused Ruldu Singh and Jaswinder Singh were died. so proceedings against them were abated. Accused/petitioners and complainant/respondents No.2 and 3 have appeared before undersigned and made their statement in support of compromise so effected between them to the effect that they have entered into compromise with their own



will, without any coercion, undue influence or any pressure. It is most respectfully submitted that from the statements of petitioners/accused and complainant/respondents No.2 and 3, it seems that the compromise effected between the parties is genuine, voluntary, out of free will. Undersigned is satisfied that compromise is not the result of coercion, pressure or undue influence.

2. It is humbly submitted that as per the statement of accused/petitioners and ASI Jagdev Singh No.1412/BTI, in the present case except the accused/petitioners there are other accused persons namely Major Singh, Nazar Singh, Harjinder Singh, Palwinder Singh @ Baggi, Gurtej Singh, Gurwinder Singh, Karam Singh, Harveer Singh and Mandeep Singh but they have already been acquitted vide judgment dated 06.03.2025 passed by Ms. Mamta Kakkar, the then Learned Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Phul and accused Ruldu Singh and Jaswinder Singh were died, so proceedings against them were abated. Except them. there is no other accused in this case.

3. Further, it is submitted that there are only aggrieved/victims/injured/complainant in this case namely Rajindder Kumar and Gurmeet Singh i.e. respondent No.2 and 3 and except them there is no other complainant/aggrieved/injured in this case.

4. Further, it is respectfully submitted that as per the statements of ASI Jagdev Singh No.1412/BTI, accused/petitioners was neither declared as proclaimed offender/person in any case till date nor such proceedings are pending against him.”

4. Learned counsel for respondent Nos.2 and 3 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-10).

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.0013 dated 07.02.2018 under Sections 447, 506, 511, 148, 149, 120-B of the Indian Penal



Code, 1860 and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, 1959 (Section 120-B of IPC, 1860, and Sections 25, 27 of the Arms Act, 1959 deleted later-on), registered at Police Station City Rampura, District Bathinda and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 14.08.2025 (Annexure P-10), are, hereby, quashed qua the petitioners.

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

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

22.09.2025

jatin

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