



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

268

CRM-M-51985-2025
Date of decision: 13.10.2025

VIJAY KUMAR AND OTHERS

.....Petitioners

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER

.....Respondents

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

Present: - Mr. Vipul Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Savi Nagpal, Asst. A.G. Punjab.

Mr. Amit Khari, Advocate for
Mr. Lalit Narang, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioners have approached this Court seeking quashing of FIR No.249 dated 02.12.2024 under Sections 406 and 420 of IPC registered at Police Station City Rajpura, District Patiala and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 22.08.2025 (Annexure P-2) effected between the parties.

2. Pursuant to the order dated 17.09.2025, report has been received from the Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Rajpura vide Memo No. 1292



dated 08.10.2025. The relevant extract of the report reads thus:-

1.	<i>Name of the complainant/victims(s) /aggrieved person(s)</i>	<i>As per statement of Investigating Officer ASI Nishan Singh - 1231/Patiala there is only one complainant/victim/aggrieved person namely Parshant Kapoor son of Sh. Sudarshan Kapoor, resident of House No. 01, Near K.K. School, Rajpura Town, Tehsil Rajpura and District Patiala (Punjab) in the present case.</i>
2	<i>Date on which the statement(s) of the complainant/victim(s)/ aggrieved persons were recorded.</i>	<i>Statement of the complainant/victim/aggrieved person namely Parshant Kapoor was recorded on 29.09.2025</i>
3	<i>Has the identify of the complainant//victim(s)/ aggrieved person been verified.</i>	<i>Yes</i>
4	<i>Whether all the victims/all the aggrieved persons have compromised the matter.?</i>	<i>Yes</i>
5	<i>Is the pressure, threat or coercion upon the victims/aggrieved</i>	<i>No</i>



	<i>persons/complainant.</i>	
6	<i>Name of the accused persons.</i>	<i>As per statement of Investigating Officer ASI Nishan Singh-1231/Patiala names of accused are no.1 Vijay Kumar son of Tej Bhan, 2. Anita Rani wife of Vijay Kumar, 3. Himanshu Kumar son of Vijay Kumar and 4. Varun Kumar son of Vijay Kumar, all residents of House No. 2913, Near Panjiri Plant, Rajpura Town, Tehsil Rajpura, District Patiala.</i>
7	<i>Date on which the statement (s) of the accused persons were recorded.</i>	<i>Statement of the accused persons were recorded on 29.09.2025</i>
8	<i>Whether all the accused have compromised the matter? If no, then the names of the accused who have compromised.</i>	<i>Yes, all the accused have compromised the matter.</i>
9	<i>Whether proclamation proceedings are pending against any accused”</i>	<i>No.</i>
10	<i>Has the police report been filed or not?</i>	<i>No.</i>
11	<i>Notice of accusation/charges have been framed or</i>	<i>No.</i>



	<i>not?</i>	
<i>12</i>	<i>Sections of Statues invoked in the matter.</i>	<i>406, 420 and 120-B of IPC</i>
<i>13</i>	<i>Whether the Court is satisfied with the genuineness of the compromise.</i>	<i>Yes.</i>

3. A perusal of the aforesaid report shows that compromise has been effected voluntarily between the parties and is genuine and without coercion or any undue pressure.

4. 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.

5. Mr. Amit Khari, Advocate for Mr. Lalit Narang, Advocate appears on behalf of respondents No. 2 and reiterates the settlement and his concurrence to the FIR and all the other consequential proceedings being quashed.

6. The Full Bench of this Court in the matter of “***Kulwinder Singh and others versus State of Punjab and another***” reported as (***Punjab and Haryana High Court***) : ***2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052*** has been observed as under :

'(28) To conclude, it can safely be said that there can never be any hard and fast category which can be prescribed to enable the Court to exercise its power under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. The only principle that can be laid down is the one which has



been incorporated in the Section itself, i.e., "to prevent abuse of the process of any Court" or "to secure the ends of justice".

(29) In Mrs. Shakuntala Sawhney v. Mrs. Kaushalya Sawhney and Ors., Hon'ble Krishna Iyer, J. aptly summoned up the essence of compromise in the following words:

"The finest hour of justice arrives propitiously when parties, despite falling apart, bury the hatchet and weave a sense of fellowship of reunion."

(30) The power to do complete justice is the very essence of every judicial justice dispensation system. It cannot be diluted by distorted perceptions and is not a slave to anything, except to the caution and circumspection, the standards of which the Court sets before it, in exercise of such plenary and unfettered power inherently vested in it while donning the cloak of compassion to achieve the ends of justice.

(31) No embargo, be in the shape of Section 320(9) of the Cr.P.C., or any other such curtailment, can whittle down the power under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C.

(32) The compromise, in a modern society, is the sine qua non of harmony and orderly behaviour. It is the soul of justice and if the power under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. is used to enhance such a compromise which, in turn, enhances the social amity and reduces friction, then it truly is "finest hour of justice". Disputes which have their genesis in a matrimonial discord, landlord-tenant matters, commercial transactions and other such matters can safely be dealt with by the Court by exercising its powers under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. in the event of a compromise, but this is not to say that the power is limited to such cases. There can never be any such rigid rule to prescribe the exercise of such power, especially in the absence



of any premonitions to forecast and predict eventualities which the cause of justice may throw up during the course of a litigation.

(33) The only inevitable conclusion from the above discussion is that there is no statutory bar under the Cr.P.C. which can affect the inherent power of this Court under Section 482. Further, the same cannot be limited to matrimonial cases alone and the Court has the wide power to quash the proceedings even in non-compoundable offences notwithstanding the bar under Section 320 of the Cr.P.C., in order to prevent the abuse of law and to secure the ends of justice.

(34) The power under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. is to be exercised Ex-Debitia Justitia to prevent an abuse of process of Court. There can neither be an exhaustive list nor the defined para-meters to enable a High Court to invoke or exercise its inherent powers. It will always depend upon the facts and circumstances of each case. The power under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. has no limits. However, the High Court will exercise it sparingly and with utmost care and caution. The exercise of power has to be with circumspection and restraint. The Court is a vital and an extra-ordinary effective instrument to maintain and control social order. The Courts play role of paramount importance in achieving peace, harmony and everlasting congeniality in society. Resolution of a dispute by way of a compromise between two warring groups, therefore, should attract the immediate and prompt attention of a Court which should endeavour to give full effect to the same unless such compromise is abhorrent to lawful composition of the society or would promote savagery.



7. The legal principles as laid down for quashing of the FIR were also approved by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of '**Gian Singh Versus State of Punjab and another,(2012)10 SCC 303'**. Still further, the broad principles for exercising the powers under Section 482 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'.

8. 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. Besides, merely because there are other FIRs against the petitioners, it should not act as a bar against amicable resolution of the dispute.

9. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has held in the matter of '**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. The observation of the Hon'ble Supreme Court is extracted as under:-



19. We thus sum-up and hold that as opposed to Section 320 Cr.P.C. where the Court is squarely guided by the compromise between the parties in respect of offences 'compoundable' within the statutory framework, the extra-ordinary power enjoined upon a High Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C. or vested in this Court under Article 142 of the Constitution, can be invoked beyond the metes and bounds of Section 320 Cr.P.C. Nonetheless, we reiterate that such powers of wide amplitude ought to be exercised carefully in the context of quashing criminal proceedings, bearing in mind: (i) Nature and effect of the offence on the conscious of the society; (ii) Seriousness of the injury, if any; (iii) Voluntary nature of compromise between the accused and the victim; & (iv) Conduct of the accused persons, prior to and after the occurrence of the purported offence and/or other relevant considerations.

10. 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 582 of BNSS, 2023:-

- i) The present dispute emanates from property transaction arising out of sale and purchase of immoveable property.
- ii) A mutual settlement has been reached between the parties and the first party does not want to take any legal action against the second party.
- 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 and forcing the parties to undergo rigours of criminal proceedings is not likely to subserve any larger public interest;
- v) The proceedings are likely to end in futility for want of parties to support the case of the prosecution;
- vi) No larger public purpose would be served by continuation of the proceedings;
- vii) The complainant is not likely to support the case of the prosecution. Continuation of the proceedings is likely to be a waste of judicial time. The object of law is well served when the parties resolve their differences and choose to peacefully co-exist and live in harmony.

11. In view of the report of the Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Rajpura and the principles laid down by the Apex Court in **Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab and another (2012) 10 SCC 303**, as well as **Ramgopal And Another Vs State of Madhya Pradesh 2021 SCC Online SC 834** and also by the Full Bench of this Court in **Kulwinder Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and another, 2007(3) RCR (Criminal) 1052**, the instant petition is allowed. The aforesaid FIR No.249 dated 02.12.2024 under Sections 406 and 420 of IPC registered at Police Station City Rajpura, District Patiala and all other consequential proceedings arising therefrom **are hereby quashed** qua the petitioners in view of compromise dated 22.08.2025 (Annexure P-2).

However, the same would be subject to payment of costs of **Rs.25,000/-** to



CRM-M-51985-2025

-10-

be deposited by each of the petitioners with the Punjab Chief Minister Relief Fund, Account No.001934001000589, Punjab State Co-op. Bank, IFSC: TPSC0000019, within a period of two months from receipt of certified copy of this order.

Petition is allowed.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

OCTOBER 13, 2025
Vishal Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No