

CRM-M-57305-2025

2025:PHHC:157088

215 (2nd case)

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

CRM-M-57305-2025

Date of decision: November 13, 2025

Labhu @ Lattu and others

....Petitioners

versus

State of Punjab and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL**Present:-** Mr. Chandan Singh Rana, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Jaypreet Singh, DAG Punjab.

Ms. Komal Sohi, Advocate for

Mr. Vikrant Pujara, Advocate for respondents No.2 to 5.

SUMEET GOEL, J. (ORAL)

The present petition has been filed under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') for quashing of FIR No.134 dated 18.07.2025 (Annexure P-1), under Sections 115(2), 118(1), 126(2), 351(2) & 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS'), registered at Police Station Salem Tabri, District Police Commissionerate, Ludhiana and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise/affidavit dated 29.09.2025 (Annexure P-2), which is stated to have been effected between the parties.

2. On 14.10.2025, the following order was passed:

“The petitioners have approached this Court seeking quashing of FIR (Annexure P-1) and all consequential proceedings emanating

CRM-M-57305-2025

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-DB.

Notice of motion.

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

Mr. Vikrant Pujara, Advocate has filed memorandum of appearance for respondent Nos.2 to 5. 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 18.10.2025 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. 13.11.2025.

The petitioners are directed to deposit a sum of ₹25,000/- as costs with the Punjab & Haryana High Court Bar Clerks' Association, Bank details whereof reads thus:

CRM-M-57305-2025

Account No. 65004775776;

IFSC Code: SBIN0050306;

Branch Code: 50306;

Bank: State Bank of India, High Court Branch, Chandigarh

Payment of costs and production of receipt thereof shall be a condition precedent for recording of statements in the manner directed for hereinabove.

To be heard alongwith CRM-M-56916-2025.”

3. Pursuant to the aforesaid order, report dated 01.11.2025 from the Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Ludhiana has been received, which is taken on record. As per said report, the Trial Court has recorded as follows:

“2. It is further respectfully submitted that complainant Shankar @ Shankar Giri as well as other victims namely Pammi, Buta Giri and Shiva minor through his father Buta Giri have got their statement recorded that FIR No.134 of 18.07.2025, under Sections 115 (2), 118(1), 126(2), 351(2), 3 (5) BNS, PS Salem Tabri, Ludhiana, was registered against the accused persons namely Labhu @Lattu, Sunil and Veena on the basis of statement of complainant. Now with the intervention of respectables, they have compromised the matter with the above mentioned accused persons vide compromise deed Ex. C1 without any coercion or undue influence and out of their free will. They have no objection if the above said FIR and the consequential proceedings are quashed as a whole against the above mentioned accused in view of the compromise. Copies of identity proofs of complainant and victims have been placed on record as Ex. C2 to Ex. C4.

3. Accused persons namely Labhu @Lattu, Sunil and Veena have also got their joint statement recorded that present FIR was registered against them on the basis of statement of complainant Shankar and now with the intervention of respectables, they have compromised the matter with each other without any coercion or undue influence and out of their free will. The above said FIR along with all the subsequent proceedings may be quashed against them in view of the compromise Ex. C1. They placed on record Photo copies of their self attested Aadhar Cards as Ex. C6 to Ex. C7. Further accused persons/ petitioners have deposited a sum of Rs.25,000/- as costs with the Punjab & Haryana High Court Bar Clerks Association in Account No. 65004775776 and receipt of said payment has also been placed on record by them.

4. ASI Harmesh Lal No. 1330/LDH, posted at police Station Salem Tabri, Ludhiana got recorded his statement that FIR No.134 dated 18.07.2025 U/s 115(2), 118(1), 126(2), 351(2), 3(5) BNS, Police Station Salem Tabri, Ludhiana, was registered on the statement of complainant/victim Shankar @ Shankar Giri against three accused persons namely Labhu @Lattu, Sunil and Veena. Complainant alongwith Pammi, Buta Giri and Shiva (minor through his father Buta Giri) (respondents no.2 to 5) were the victims in this case.

There are three accused persons in the present case and no other accused other than the petitioners. There is no other complainant or affected/aggrieved party other than the respondents. None of the accused has ever been declared as Proclaimed offender in the present case.

5. It is further humbly submitted that:-

CRM-M-57305-2025

- (1) *There are only three accused persons namely Labhu @Lattu, Sunil and Veena in the aforesaid FIR and there is no other accused other than the petitioners arrayed in this petition.*
- (2) *There is no other complainant or affected/aggrieved party other than the respondents arrayed in this petition.*
- (3) *No accused has ever been declared as Proclaimed Offender.*
This is for your kind information, please.”

4. Learned counsel for respondents No.2 to 5 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-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.*

CRM-M-57305-2025

- (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 charge-sheet 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. 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.134 dated 18.07.2025 (Annexure P-1), under Sections 115(2), 118(1), 126(2), 351(2) & 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS'), registered at Police Station Salem Tabri, District Police Commissionerate, Ludhiana and

CRM-M-57305-2025

all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise/affidavit dated 29.09.2025 (Annexure P-2), are, hereby, quashed *qua* the petitioners.

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

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

November 13, 2025

mahavir

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No