



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

271

CRM-M-5348-2026 (O&M)

Date of decision: 09.04.2026

Milandeep

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Haryana and another

...Respondent(s)

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

Present :- Mr. Satbir Rathore, Advocate and
Ms. Jyotika Behl, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Onkar Singh Wahla, Sr. DAG Haryana.

Ms. Saksham Sharma, Advocate for
Mr. Vinod Pundir, Advocate for respondent No.2.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in the present petition is for quashing of case bearing FIR No.169 dated 02.07.2023 registered under Sections 323, 506 IPC and Section 326-A IPC at Police Station Panipat, Sadar, District Panipat along with all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 26.01.2026 (Annexure P-3).

2. The FIR in the present case was registered on the complaint/statement made by Randeep Singh, son of Ramesh Singh, resident of village Salwan. As per the prosecution version, the complainant stated that he was employed with M/s Harveer Singh Company at Panipat Refinery, where the petitioner had also been working for approximately one year. It is alleged that the petitioner was terminated from service about two

months prior to the occurrence and was thereafter employed with KCC (Kalpana) Company. The complainant further alleged that, following his termination, the petitioner had been extending threats to assault him. On 01.07.2023, when the complainant had gone to the canteen for tea, the petitioner confronted him, abused him and threatened him. It is further alleged that the petitioner attacked the complainant with an iron rod on his head, as a result of which he lost consciousness. It is also alleged that the petitioner poured some hot substance upon the complainant's body and inflicted injuries on his lower back with a sharp-edged weapon. Upon regaining consciousness, the complainant informed one Parveen Rana, a resident of his village, about the incident. It is further alleged that the petitioner continued to extend threats to kill the complainant. On the basis of the aforesaid allegations, the complainant sought legal action against the petitioner, leading to the registration of the present FIR.

3. However, with the intervention of the respectables, the parties have decided to compromise the matter. Hence, the present petition.

4. The parties were directed to appear before the learned trial Court/Illaq Magistrate vide order dated 02.02.2026 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.

5. Pursuant to the said order, report has been received from the District and Sessions Judge, Panipat vide Memo No. 5595 dated 26.02.2026.

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

<i>S. No.</i>	<i>Information required</i>
<i>Question I</i>	<i>Total number of persons found involved as accused in the dispute/FIR;</i>
<i>Answer</i>	<i>Only one person namely Milandeep was found involved as accused in the dispute/FIR</i>
<i>Question II</i>	<i>Number of complainant/victim(s);</i>
<i>Answer</i>	<i>There is only one complainant/victim namely Randeep Singh</i>
<i>Question III</i>	<i>Whether all the accused and complainant / victims are party to compromise & signed the same;</i>
<i>Answer</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Question IV</i>	<i>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;</i> <i>OR</i> <i>His/her statement is still to be recorded, in compliance to the direction of this Court, details of such person;</i>
<i>Answer</i>	<i>N.A.</i>
<i>Question V</i>	<i>Whether any accused has been declared as a proclaimed offender/person or any such proceedings against him/her have been initiated or pending adjudication;</i>
<i>Answer</i>	<i>No</i>

Question VI	<i>Report of the Court whether compromise is genuine, voluntary, and without any coercion or undue influence;</i>
Answer	<i>Based on the statements of complainant/victim Randeep Singh and accused Milandeep, the compromise is found to be genuine, voluntary and without any coercion or undue influence</i>
Question VII	<i>Any other aspect relevant to the present case.</i>
Answer	<i>In view of the provisions of Section 320 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, offence punishable under Section 326A of the Indian Penal Code is not compoundable.</i>

6. 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.

7. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent No. 2 reiterates the settlement and his concurrence to the FIR and all the other consequential proceedings being quashed and affirmed during statement before the trial Court.

8. 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'. 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.”*

9. 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 and the complainant are co-villagers and the dispute, which appears to have arisen out of personal differences, has now been amicably resolved between them, thereby restoring cordial relations.
- ii. The petitioner is approximately 29 years of age and

continuation of criminal proceedings is likely to have serious adverse consequences on his livelihood, social standing and his ability to discharge familial and professional obligations.

- iii. The FIR in question pertains to the year 2023 and the proceedings are still at an nascent stage, with no substantial progress having been made in the trial.
- iv. The nature of the allegations, though not to be trivialised, does not fall within the category of heinous or grave offences that would shock the conscience of society or have wide-ranging public ramifications.
- v. The dispute appears to be personal in nature and does not involve any element affecting public peace or societal order at large.
- vi. In view of the compromise, the complainant is unlikely to support the prosecution case, thereby rendering the continuation of proceedings an exercise in futility.
- vii. Continuation of the criminal proceedings, in such circumstances, would not subserve any larger public interest and would only result in unnecessary harassment to the parties and wastage of valuable judicial time.
- viii. The ends of justice would, therefore, be better served by putting a quietus to the dispute rather than allowing the proceedings to continue without any meaningful prospect of conviction.

10. In view of the report of the District and Sessions Judge, Panipat 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. FIR No.169 dated 02.07.2023 registered under Sections 323, 506 IPC and Section 326-A IPC at Police Station Panipat, Sadar, District Panipat along with all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, are hereby quashed qua the petitioner(s) on the basis of compromise dated 26.01.2026 (Annexure P-3).

11. Petition is allowed.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

09.04.2026

Mangal Singh

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