



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

239

CRM-M-51073-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 21.11.2025.

JAGDEEP SINGH @ JIMMI AND OTHERS

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER

...Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Harvinder Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Sukhbir Maandi, Advocate, for the petitioners.

Ms. Savi Nagpal, AAG, Punjab.

Ms. Amarjeet Kaur, Advocate for respondent No.2.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

Jurisdiction of this Court, has been invoked for seeking quashing of FIR No.0040 dated 28.02.2025 under Sections 127(1), 115(2), 351(2), 189, 190 of BNS, 2023 registered at Police Station City Tarn Taran, District Tarn Taran and along with all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 29.08.2025 (Annexure P-2) entered between the parties.

2. The instant FIR was registered on the statement of Santokh Singh, aged 39 years, a property dealer residing at Guru Ram Dass Avenue, Tarn Taran, who stated that approximately two years earlier, an agreement to sell had been executed between Jagchanan Singh and Gurpreet Singh of Amritsar on one side, and Parminder Singh (also known as Billu), resident of Sultanwind Road, Gali No. 13, Mandir Wali, Amritsar, on the other,



pertaining to a 40-marla plot situated at Kakka Kandiala. Although the date for registration of the sale deed had expired, the parties mutually extended the date in the presence of respectable persons. On 28.01.2025, it was verbally decided that registration of 20 marlas from the said property would be effected on 09.02.2025. Santokh Singh stated that on 06.02.2025, at around 5:00 p.m., while he and his associate Tejinder Singh were near Tarn Taran, he received a call from Jagdeep Singh @ Jimmy asking him to come near Gyani Dhaba. When they reached the spot, Jagdeep Singh @ Jimmy, Jaspal Singh, Parminder Singh @ Billu, and two unknown persons met him. After a short conversation, and on the instructions of Jimmy and Billu, two unknown persons caught hold of Santokh Singh at gunpoint and forced him into a Jaguar car (registration No. CH-01-CK-3291), in which Sukhjinder Singh of Budhabeh and Gurvinder Singh @ Laddi of Nakodar Road, Jalandhar, were already sitting. Jimmy, Jaspal, and Billu also entered the vehicle. Inside the car, Santokh Singh was beaten and threatened with death. The assailants later pushed him out of the vehicle near the canal at Shekh Fatta, abandoning him on the roadside. He managed to save his life and return home. Even thereafter, the accused persons continued to threaten him and his brother. Attempts by respectable persons to resolve the dispute failed.

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

4. However, on 29.08.2025, the parties compromised the matter with the intervention of the respectables and filed the present petition for seeking quashing of FIR on the basis of compromise.

5. Status report by way of affidavit dated 18.11.2025 of Mr. Rajesh Kakkar, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub-Division



Tarn Taran, District Tarn Taran, Punjab on behalf of respondent No.1 has been filed in Court today and the same is taken on record.

6. The parties were directed to appear before the learned trial Court/Illaq Magistrate vide order dated 11.09.2025 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.

7. Pursuant to the said order, report has been received from the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Tarn Taran, vide Memo No.728 dated 19.11.2025.

The relevant extract of the report is reproduced as under:-

“The report with regard to the compromise is as under:-

(i) There is one victim/complainant in FIR. All the victim/complainant are party to the compromise. That there are total 5 accused party to compromise.

(iii) During investigation no additional accused has been added.

(iv) None of the accused has been declared as Proclaimed absconder.

v) There is no investigation pending against any of the accused nor any accused has been declared as innocent.

Report is submitted as desired, please.”

8. 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.

9. Ms. Amarjeet Kaur, Advocate, appears on behalf of respondent No.2 and reiterates the settlement and her concurrence to the FIR and all the other consequential proceedings being quashed.

10. 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**

***Bhimsinhbhai 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 transactions 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.

11. 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.

12. 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.

13. 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 No.1 is in the age bracket of 30 to 35 years



whereas petitioners No.2 to 5 are 45-51 years old and continuation of criminal proceedings will severely impede the petitioners in discharge of their social and career obligations.

- (i) The petitioners have not been declared as a proclaimed offender/person and no other criminal proceedings against any of them had been initiated or are pending adjudication.
- (ii) The FIR in question pertains to the year 2025 and trial is still at initial stage. Putting an end to the proceedings will bring peace and tranquility among the parties.
- (iii) 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;
- (iv) 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.

14. In view of the report of the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Tarn Taran, 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 No.0040 dated 28.02.2025 under Sections 127(1), 115(2), 351(2), 189, 190 of BNS, 2023 registered at Police Station City Tarn Taran, District Tarn Taran alongwith all other consequential proceedings arising therefrom, are hereby quashed in view of compromise dated 29.08.2025 (Annexure P-2) entered between the parties.



CRM-M-51073-2025 (O&M) 8

15. Petition is allowed.

21.11.2025
monika

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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