



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

346

CRM-M-8123-2026

HARJINDER SINGH SIDHU

...PETITIONER

V/s

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

...RESPONDENTS

Date of decision: 17.03.2026

Date of Uploading: 17.03.2026

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. J.K. Singla, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Gaurav Gurcharan S. Rai, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Ms. Suman Rani, Advocate for respondents No.2 to 5.

SUMEET GOEL, J.

1. The 2nd petition has been filed under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023 for quashing of FIR No.178 dated 21.10.2020 under Section 420 of IPC (Act No.45 of 1860) and Section 10 of Punjab Travel Professionals (Regulation) Act, 2014, registered at Police Station City 1 Mansa, District Mansa and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 03.02.2026 (Annexure P-3), which is stated to have been effected between the parties.

2 On 17.02.2026, the following order was passed:

“The petitioner has 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. Learned counsel for the petitioner 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. Adhiraj Singh, AAG, Punjab has put in appearance on behalf of respondent No.1-State of and accepts notice.

Ms. Suman Rani, Advocate has entered appearance on behalf of respondent Nos.2 to 5 and filed her power of attorney.

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 21.02.2026 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. 17.03.2026.”

3. Pursuant to the aforesaid order, report dated 09.03.2026 from Chief Judicial Magistrate, Mansa, has been received, which is taken on record. As per the report, the Trial Court has recorded as follows:-

“1 In their joint statement, complainants (respondents No.2 to 5) namely Harpreet Singh son of Darshan Singh, Rio village Karamgarh Autanwali, Tehsil & District Mansa, Hardaat Singh son of Naib Singh, Rio village Kotli Khurd, District Bathinda, Arun Kumar son of Ruldu Ram, R/o Maur Mandi, Tehsil Maur Mandi, District Bathinda, presently residing at Sweden through his father Ruldu Ram son of Bansi Ram. R/o Maur Mandi, Tehsil Maur Mandi, District Bathinda and Gurpiar Singh son of Saun Singh, R/o village Chandpura. District Fatehabad (Haryana) have stated that the FIR No.178 dated 21.10.2020, under Section 420 IPC and Section 10 of Punjab Travel Professionals Regulation ACLARIT Police Station, City 1. Mansa was registered on the basis of then statement against Harjinder Singh Sidhu son of Lal Singh, Rit Village Mehal Kalan. District Barnala, presently residing at Palm Enclave, Morinda, District Roopnagar. They have further stated that now with the intervention of respectable persons of the society. relatives and friends, they have entered into compromise with the above named accused and they are deposing in the Court with their own free will, voluntarily, without any coercion and undue influence. They have produced photocopy of compromise deed as mark-A and photocopies of their Aadhar cards as mark-B, mark-C mark-D and mark-F respectively.

2 That in his statement, petitioner-accused namely Harjinder Singh Sidhu son of Lal Singh, R/o village Mehal Kalan. District Barnala, presently residing at Palm Enclave, Morinda, District Roopnagar has stated that the FIR No.178 dated 21.10.2020, under Section 420 IPC and Section 10 of Punjab Travel Professionals Regulation Act, 2014. Police Station, City 1, Mansa was registered against him on the basis of statement of complainants namely Harpreet Singh son of Darshan Singh, R/o village Karamgarh Autanwali. Tehsil & District Mansa, Hardaat Singh son of Naib Singh. R/o village Kotli Khurd, District Bathinda, Arun Kumar son of Ruldu Ram, Rio Maur Mandi, Tehsil Maur Mandi. District Bathinda. Petitioner-



accused has further stated that now with the Intervemion of respesianie persons of the native and friends, be has entered into compromes with the snove ne complainants. He has further stated that he is deposing in tuc Coun with his own free will, voluntarily, wnonut any coercion allt ande influence. He has produced photocopy of his Aadhar card as mark-F.

3 In his statement, SI Sukhjeet Singh No.585 Mapaa posted as SHO, PS City 1, Mansa has stated that as per the record maintained with the police station the requisite information of case FIR No.178 dated 21.10.2020, under Section 420 IPC and Section 10 of Punjab Travel Professionals Regulation Act, 2014. Police Station, City 1. Mansa is that Harjinder Singh Sidhu son of Lal Singh, Ro village Mehal Kalan, District Barnala, presently residing at Palm Enclave, Morinda, District Roopnagar has been arrayed as accused in this FIR and except him no other accused is involved in this case. S1 Sukhjeet Singh has further stated that as per record, the present FIR was registered on the basis of statements of complainants namely Harpreet Singh son of Darshan Singh. R/o village Karamgarh Autanwali, Tehsil & District Mansa, Hardaat Singh son of Naib Singh, R/o village Kotli Khurd. District Bathinda, Arun Kumar son of Ruldu Ram, R/o Maur Mandi, Tehsil Maur Mandi. District Bathinda and Gurpiar Singh son of Saun Singh, R/o village Chandpura, District Fatehabad (Haryana) and except the above is no other complainant named complainants there or affected/aggrieved party in the above said FIR. IHe has further stated that no accused has been declared as proclaimed offender in the present case.

4 That as per record and statements of the parties, there is no other accused other than the petitioner in the present FIR. As per the statement of SI Sukhjeet Singh, there is no other complainant or affected/aggrieved party other than the respondents in the present FIR and no accused has been declared proclaimed offender in the present FIR.

5 The above statements of parties have been recorded in presence of their counsels. So, I am satisfied that the compromise effected between the appearing parties is genuine, voluntary and without any coercion or undue influence and all the affected parties have entered into compromise. Copies of statements of parties have been attached with this report.”

4. Learned counsel for respondent Nos.2 to 5 admits the factum of parties having compromised and states that she has no objection in case the FIR and all proceedings subsequent thereto against the petitioner is quashed.



5. Similarly, learned State counsel has stated no objection in case the FIR is quashed based upon the compromise (Annexure P-3).

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.178 dated 21.10.2020 under Section 420 of IPC (Act No.45 of 1860) and Section 10 of Punjab Travel Professionals (Regulation) Act, 2014, registered at Police Station City 1 Mansa, District Mansa and all consequential proceedings

arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 03.02.2026 (Annexure P-3), are, hereby, quashed.

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

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

17.03.2026
jatin

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