



In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana, at Chandigarh

Criminal Misc. No. M-14956 of 2026

Date of Decision: 17.04.2026

Manpreet Singh

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and Others

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Surya Partap Singh.

Present: Ms. Harkirat Kaur, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Eklavya Darshi, Deputy Advocate General,
Punjab, for the respondent No.1.

Mr. G.S.Rawat, Advocate
for the respondents No.2 and 3.

Surya Partap Singh, J.

1. This petition under Section 528 of 'the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023' has been filed for the quashing of FIR No. 144 dated 22.11.2010, for the commission of offence punishable under Section(s) 307, 324, 148 and 149 of 'the Indian Penal Code, 1860' Police Station Kartarpur, District Jalandhar, Punjab, along with all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom. The quashing of FIR has been sought on the ground of compromise.

2. Heard.

3. This Court vide order dated 20.03.2026 had directed the parties to appear before the learned trial Court, for the recording of their statements. The learned trial Court, too, was directed to submit a report.

4. Pursuant to above-mentioned order, a report from the Court of learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Jalandhar, dated 10.04.2026 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 amicably settled between them, 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. According to above-mentioned report, 'Manpreet Singh' (the petitioner) was declared proclaimed offender, however, the order declaring him a proclaimed offender was quashed by this Court by virtue of order dated 29.01.2026. In her report, the learned Judicial Magistrate has also stated that co-accused, namely 'Rohit', 'Rahul Kundra', 'Dimple Kumar', 'Karan Kumar' and 'Rocky' were acquitted by the court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jalandhar, by virtue of order dated 18.01.2012.

5. The record has been perused carefully.

6. If the factual matrix of the present case is 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;
- iii) that it does not involve heinous and serious offence of mental depravity;
- iv) that the action of petitioner does not have a serious impact on the society;
- 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 respondents have amicably settled the matter between them in terms of the compromise deed and the statements recorded before the concerned Court;
- vii) that perusal of the documents reveals that the settlement has not been secured through coercion, threats, social boycotts, bribes, or other dubious means;
- viii) that the victims have 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.

7. 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 jurisdiction, by virtue of 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.

8. 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. As per the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, 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.

9. In view of above-mentioned judgments and after perusing the report of the trial Court regarding amicable settlement between the petitioners and the respondents No.2 & 3, 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. In view of above-mentioned observations, the present petition is hereby **allowed**, subject to payment of ₹50,000/- as cost. The cost shall be deposited, by the petitioner, in the Legal Aid Funds, being managed by the High Court Legal Services Committee within a period of two months from today. Subject to payment of cost, the FIR No. 144 dated 22.11.2010, for the commission of offence punishable under Section(s) 307, 324, 148 and 149 of IPC Police Station Kartarpur, District Jalandhar, Punjab and all the consequential proceedings arising out of the above-mentioned FIR shall stand quashed.

(Surya Partap Singh)
Judge

April 17, 2026
“DK”

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No