



CRM-M-11535-2026

-1-

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

207

CRM-M-11535-2026

Date of Decision:30.03.2026

Gagandeep Singh alias Gaganpreet Singh and others

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present:- Dr. Anmol Rattan Sidhu, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Harlove Singh Rajput, Advocate,
Mr. Gursher Singh Dhillon, Advocate,
Mr. Jashandeep Bains, Advocate and
Ms. Sakshi Goel, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Ferry Sofat, Additional Advocate General, Punjab.

Mr. G. S. Sidhu, Advocate and
Mr. Kamal Gupta, Advocate
for respondent no.2.

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J. (Oral)

The instant petition has been filed under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (corresponding to Section 482 Cr.P.C.) seeking quashing of judgment of conviction dated 10.09.2025 and orders of sentence dated 12.09.2025 and 22.09.2025, passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Tarn Taran, Annexure P-2, and FIR No.69 dated 04.03.2013, registered under Sections 323, 354, 506 read with Sections 149 and 148 IPC and Sections 3(i)(x), 3(I) and 4 of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes Prevention of Atrocities Act, 1989 at Police Station City Tarn Taran, District Tarn Taran, Annexure P-1, in view of the compromise, dated 04.02.2026, Annexure P-3, entered into between the petitioners and the



complainant to settle their disputes in question. Against the aforesaid judgment of conviction, the following appeals are pending for adjudication before this Court:

Sr. No.	Case No.	Case Title
1.	CRA-S-2991-2025	Manjinder Singh v. State of Punjab
2.	CRA-S-3451-2025	Kawaldeep Singh @ Kanwaldeep Singh v. State of Punjab
3.	CRA-S-3150-2025	Gagandeep Singh @ Gaganpreet Singh v. State of Punjab
4.	CRA-S-3148-2025	Ashwani Kumar and another v. State of Punjab
5.	CRA-S-2970-2025	Narinder Singh and another v. State of Punjab
6.	CRA-S-3075-2025	Davinder Kumar and another v. State of Punjab
7.	CRA-S-3126-2025	Harjinder Singh v. State of Punjab
8.	CRA-S-1043-2026	Harvinder Singh alias Soshi v. State of Punjab

2. Learned senior counsel for the petitioners contends that the petitioners and the complainant have settled their disputes by way of compromise dated 04.02.2026, Annexure P-3.

3. As the parties entered into a compromise to resolve their disputes which led to registration of the criminal case, they were directed to appear before the Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court for getting their statements recorded in that regard, vide order dated 27.02.2026. Pursuant thereto, a report, dated 25.03.2026, has been received from Chief Judicial Magistrate, Tarn Taran, stating that the compromise arrived at between the parties is without any pressure, coercion or undue influence. There is no criminal case pending against the petitioners, nor have they been declared proclaimed person(s).



4. Learned State counsel and learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent no.2/complainant admit the factum of compromise, and submit that they have no objection to quashing of the judgment of conviction and order of sentence and the FIR on that basis.

5. It has been held by the Supreme Court of India in cases *Gian Singh v. State of Punjab and another*, 2012(10) SCC 303 and *State of Madhya Pradesh v. Laxmi Narayan and others*, (2019) 5 SCC 688, that criminal cases having overwhelmingly civil character, particularly those arising out of commercial transactions or matrimonial relationships or family disputes, should be quashed when the parties have resolved their disputes among themselves in a *bona fide* manner by entering into a compromise. On similar lines is another judgment of the Supreme Court in *Shiji alias Pappu and others v. Radhika and another*, 2012 (1) SCC (Criminal) 101, wherein criminal proceedings for offences under Sections 354 and 394 IPC were quashed since the parties had entered into a compromise and there were no chances of conviction. Also, even if criminal proceedings have resulted in conviction in cases of non-compoundable offences and thereafter a compromise has been affected between the parties, the judgment of conviction can be set aside by the Court in exercise of its inherent powers to secure the ends of justice. This has been so held by the Supreme Court in *Ramgopal and another v. State of Madhya Pradesh*, (2022) 14 SCC 531.

6. A perusal of the allegations in the FIR as well as the aforesaid report establishes that the present case is of predominantly private nature and falls in the category of cases that can be quashed by the High Court in



CRM-M-11535-2026

-4-

exercise of its inherent jurisdiction under Section 482 Cr.P.C., as per law laid down in the aforementioned judgments. The petitioners have no criminal antecedents. The offences alleged are not heinous in nature and cannot be termed as crime against the society; nor do they show mental depravity of the petitioners. Besides, the incident is about thirteen years old and nothing untoward has happened between the parties thereafter. Since disputes between the parties have been amicably resolved by way of the compromise, decision on the pending appeals against conviction on merits will hamper their peaceful co-existence even after resolution of disputes.

7. Consequently, this petition is allowed. The judgment of conviction dated 10.09.2025 and orders of sentence dated 12.09.2025 and 22.09.2025, and FIR No.69 dated 04.03.2013, registered under Sections 323, 354, 506 read with Sections 149 and 148 IPC and Sections 3(i)(x), 3(I) and 4 of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes Prevention of Atrocities Act, 1989 at Police Station City Tarn Taran, District Tarn Taran, are hereby quashed *qua* the petitioners and they stand acquitted of all the charges for all intents and purposes.

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE

30.03.2026*Mehak**Whether speaking/reasoned**Yes/No**Whether reportable**Yes/No*