



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

133

CRM-M-62522-2024 (O&M)
Decided on : 26.09.2025

KAVIRAJ SINGH PABLA AND ANR. Petitioner(s)

Versus

U.T. CHANDIGARH AND ORS. Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. S.S. Kamboj, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Manish Bansal, PP, U.T., Chandigarh.

Ms. Kanika Toor, Advocate for
Mr. Risham Raag Singh, Advocate for respondents no.2 & 3.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Instant petition has been filed under Section 528 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 482 Cr.P.C.), seeking quashing of the below detailed First Information Report (FIR), and all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of the compromise dated 22.10.2024 (Annexure P-2), effected between the parties.

DETAILS OF CRIMINAL CASE:-

FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
43	11.07.2024	120-B, 406, 420 of IPC	Sector 49	Chandigarh

2. Vide order dated 29.07.2025, the affected parties were directed to appear before the learned Trial Court/Illaq Magistrate, for getting their respective statements recorded with regard to the compromise.

3. Report has since been received from learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, Chandigarh, in pursuance to the directions of this Court wherein, the factum of the compromise arrived at between the parties stands verified and confirmed. As per the report(s) compromise has indeed been effected between the parties and the same is without any pressure or coercion and out of their free will and the private respondent has also made



statement to the effect that he would have no objection if the FIR qua the accused-petitioner is quashed.

4. The trial Court has annexed the photocopy of the statements of the parties, along with its report. The relevant part of the said report is reproduced herebelow:

Sr. No.	Description	
1.	Total number of persons found involved as accused in the dispute/FIR	Two
2.	Number of complainant/victim(s)	Two
3.	Whether all the accused and complainant / victims are party to compromise & signed the same	Yes
4.	In case, any affected person (accused or complainant) is left out or not arrayed as party in the quashing petition before High Court, detail whereof; OR	No
	His/her statement is still to be recorded, in compliance to the direction of this Court, details of such person	--
5.	Whether any accused has been declared as a proclaimed offender/person or any such proceedings against him/her have been initiated or pending adjudication	No
6.	Report of the Court whether compromise is genuine, voluntary, and without any coercion or undue influence	Yes
7.	Any other aspect relevant to the present case.	Smt. Surinder Kaur Saini (accused and Ms. Beenakshi Sharma (victim) are not party to the compromise and they have not signed the same. Though, statements of Surinder Kaur Saini (accused and Ms. Beenakshi Sharma (victim) have been recorded with regard to the compromise.



5. Learned State counsel too submits that there are no other accused other than the petitioners and the private respondents are the only aggrieved person in the FIR in question.

6. In view of the report of the learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, Chandigarh, and the principles laid down by Hon'ble the Apex Court in **Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab and others (2012) 10 SCC 303**, 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 and all consequential proceedings arising out of it, are quashed.

7. Needless to say the parties shall remain bound by the terms of compromise and their statements recorded before the Court below.

8. Petition stands disposed of

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

September 26, 2025

Deepak Patwal

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*

Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*