



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

160

CRM-M No.7214 of 2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision :19.03.2026

Sandeep Gupta

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present : Mr. Pawan Kumar, Advocate the petitioner.

Mr. Ramender Singh Chauhan, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Sumit Ruhel, Advocate for respondent No.2.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J. (Oral):

1. Prayer in this petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS is for quashing of FIR No. 172 dated 26.03.2016, for the commission of offence under Sections 406, 420, 506 and 34 of IPC, Police Station Sonipat City, District Sonipat (Annexure P-1). The quashing of FIR is being sought on the basis of compromise between the parties (Annexure P-2).

2. Heard learned counsel for the parties. Case file has also been perused carefully.

3. This Court while issuing notice of motion, vide order dated 09.02.2026, in order to check the genuineness of compromise, had directed the parties to appear before the learned trial Court and get their statements recorded, with regard to the compromise.

4. Pursuant to aforesaid order, a report from the Court of learned



Chief Judicial Magistrate, Sonpeat, dated 05.03.2026, has been received. A perusal of above said report reveals that statements of the concerned persons have been recorded, who have stated that the matter has been settled by them, amicably, and that they have no objection if the FIR in question is quashed. As per report the compromise effected between the parties is genuine, without any undue influence and coercion.

5. As far as the offence allegedly committed by the petitioners is concerned, a perusal of the record shows that the offence punishable under Sections 406, 420 and 34 of IPC for which the petitioners have been prosecuted, are compoundable with the permission of the Court. If the facts and circumstances pertaining to present case are analysed in the backdrop of relevant legal principles, it transpires:-

- i) that the occurrence involved in the present case is purely personal and private in nature;
- ii) that there is no criminal history of the petitioner(s);
- iii) that it does not involve heinous and serious offence of mental depravity;
- iv) that the action of petitioner(s) do not have a serious impact on the society; and
- v) that the cause of administration of criminal justice system would remain unaffected on acceptance of the amicable settlement between the parties.
- vi) that the accused and the private respondent(s) have amicably settled the matter between them in terms of the compromise deed and the statements recorded before the concerned Court;



- vii) that a perusal of the documents reveal that the settlement has not been secured through coercion, threats, social boycotts, bribes, or other dubious means,
- viii) that the victim has willingly consented to the nullification of criminal proceedings;
- ix) that there is no objection from the private respondents in case present FIR and consequent proceedings are quashed;
- x) that in the given facts, the occurrence does not affect public peace or tranquility, moral turpitude or harm the social and moral fabric of the society or involve matters concerning public policy;
- xi) that the rejection of compromise may lead to ill will and the pendency of trial affects career and happiness;
- xii) that there is nothing on the record to prima facie consider the accused as an unscrupulous, incorrigible, and professional offender;
- xiii) that the exercise of the inherent power for quashing the conviction, sentence and all previous proceedings are justified to secure the ends of justice.

6. With regard to quashing on the basis of compromise the Full Bench of this Court in **Kulwinder Singh and others vs. State of Punjab, 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052**, held that the High Court has the power under Section 482 Cr.P.C. to allow the compounding of non-compoundable offence(s) and quash the proceedings, where the High Court is of the view that the same was required to prevent the abuse of the process of law or otherwise to secure the ends of justice. This power of quashing is not confined to matrimonial disputes alone.



7. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of **Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab and another, 2012(4) RCR (Criminal) 543**, observed that in order to secure the ends of justice or to prevent the abuse of process of Court, inherent power can be used by this Court to quash criminal proceedings in which a compromise has been effected. The relevant portion of para 57 of the said judgment reads thus: "the position that emerges from the above discussion can be summarised thus: the power of the High Court in quashing a criminal proceeding or FIR or complaint in exercise of its inherent jurisdiction is distinct and different from the power given to a criminal court for compounding the offences under Section 320 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Inherent power is of wide plenitude with no statutory limitation but it has to be exercised in accord with the guideline engrafted in such power viz; (i) to secure the ends of justice or (ii) to prevent abuse of the process of any Court."

8. In view of afore-referred principles of law, and after perusing the report of the trial Court regarding amicable settlement between the petitioner and respondent No.2, this Court finds that quashing of FIR will accord a quietus to all disputes between the parties and it is in the interest of both sides to bury the hatchet and lead a peaceful life. Thus, no useful purpose would be served in continuing the proceedings and in order to secure the ends of justice, the criminal proceedings in the present case deserve to be quashed.

9. Resultantly, the present petition is hereby allowed and the FIR No. 172 dated 26.03.2016, for the commission of offence under Sections 406, 420, 506 and 34 of IPC, Police Station Sonipat City, District Sonipat (Annexure P-



1), along with all other consequential proceedings arising therefrom, is hereby quashed on the basis of compromise.

10. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, also stands disposed of.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

19.03.2026
Manoj Bhutani

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