



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

298

CRM-M-63731-2024

Date of decision: 24.07.2025

SURAJ BHAN AND OTHERS

...PETITIONERS

V/s

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Devesh Sharma, Advocate and
Mr. Aaryan Kargwal, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Karunesh Kaushal, AAG, Punjab.

Ms. Divya Sharma, Advocate for respondent No.2.

SUMEET GOEL, J.

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023, praying for quashing of FIR No.85 dated 26.06.2024 under Sections 323, 324, 341, 506, 34 of IPC, registered at Police Station, Phase-11, Mohali District SAS Nagar (Mohali) Punjab and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 08.12.2024 (Annexure P-2), which is stated to have been effected between the parties.

2. On 18.12.2024, 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.

Notice of motion for 24.07.2025.

At this stage, Mr. Munish Sharma, DAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1-State, while Ms. Divya Sharma, Advocate, has put in appearance on behalf of respondent No.2 and filed her vakalatnama, which is taken on record.

The parties are directed to move an application before the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate concerned for getting their statements



recorded qua the factum of compromise. As and when any such application is moved and put up before the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate, the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate shall consider the said application and do the needful for recording the statements of the parties qua the factum of the compromise, on any convenient date. After recording the statements of all the affected parties, and upon getting requisite information from Investigating Officer, the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate shall submit its report on the basis of the statements so recorded, broadly on the following aspects:

(i) Whether there is any other accused other than the petitioners, 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?

(iv) 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 report be submitted before this Court on or before the next date.”

3. Pursuant to the aforesaid order, report dated 19.07.2025 from Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, SAS Nagar, Mohali has been received, which is taken on record. As per the report, the Trial Court has recorded as follows:-

“Q1. Total number and names of persons arrayed as accused?

Ans. There are three accused persons namely Suraj Bhan, Geeta and Sunil are arrayed as accused in the present case.

Q2. Whether any accused is proclaimed offender?

Ans. No, at present the above said accused persons are not declared proclaimed offender.

Q3. Total number and names of complainant and aggrieved persons arrayed as accused?

Ans. There are only one complainant/aggrieved person in the present FIR namely Ashok Kumar in the present case.

In view of the statements of the parties, I am satisfied that the compromise effected between the parties is genuine, voluntary and without any coercion or undue influence in the present FIR case. Hence, the report is submitted accordingly with original statements of the parties.”



4. Learned counsel for respondent No.2 admits the fact of parties having compromised and states that she 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.*
- (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.85 dated 26.06.2024 under Sections 323, 324, 341, 506, 34 of IPC, registered at Police Station, Phase-11, Mohali District SAS Nagar (Mohali) Punjab and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 08.12.2024 (Annexure P-2), are, hereby, quashed qua the petitioners.

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

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

July 24, 2025
jatin

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