



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

331

CRM-M-17261-2026

PARVEEN KUMAR AND OTHERS

....PETITIONERS

V/s

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

....RESPONDENTS

Date of decision: 06.05.2026

Date of Uploading: 06.05.2026

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Ms. Amandeep Kaur, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Deepak Kumar Grewal, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Divyansh Som Garg, Advocate for respondents No.2 to 5.

SUMEET GOEL, J. ORAL

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023 for quashing of FIR No.0062 dated 08.03.2025 under Sections 190, 191(2), 191(3), 115(2), 126(2), 109, 351(3) of BNS, and Section 25 (1)-B of Arms Act, Sections 190, 191(2), 191(3) of BNS have been deleted and Section 3(5) of BNS along with as well as Section 25(1)-C of Arms Act has been added, registered at Police Station Civil Line Jind, District Jind and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 12.03.2026 (Annexure P-2), which is stated to have been effected between the parties.

2. On 02.04.2026, the following order was passed:

“The petitioner has approached this Court seeking quashing of FIR and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom on



the basis of a compromise having been effected between the parties.

Notice of motion.

Ms. Priyanka Sadar, Senior DAG, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the respondents/State.

At this juncture, Mr. Kanav Goyal, Advocate and Mr. Aman Kharb, Advocate causes appearance on behalf of respondents no.2 to 5 and has filed their vakalatnama, which is taken on record.

The parties are directed to get their statements recorded qua the factum of compromise in the following manner:

(i) The petitioners shall appear before the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate concerned on 7.4.2026 or any date thereafter as fixed by trial Court/Illaq Magistrate for recording statements of the petitioners 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 petitioners, 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. 6.5.2026.

The petitioners are directed to deposit a sum of ₹40,000/- as costs with the Punjab and Haryana High Court Employees Welfare Association, bank details whereof reads thus:

Account No.37167209613;

IFSC Code : SBIN0050306;

Branch Code : 50306 &

Bank : State Bank of India, High Court Branch, Chandigarh.

Payment of costs and production of receipt thereof shall be a condition precedent for recording of statements in the manner directed for hereinabove.

It is explicit that the payment of costs and recording of statements shall not be construed as any kind of equity in favour of the petitioners.”

3. Pursuant to the aforesaid order, report dated 18.04.2026 from Additional District & Sessions Judge, Jind has been received, which is taken on record. As per the report, the Trial Court has recorded as follows:-

“With reference to the subject cited above, it is humbly submitted that vide order dated 02.04.2026 passed in CRM-M-17261- 2026 titled as 'Parveen Kumar and others vs. State of Haryana and others', both the parties were directed to appear before the Trial Court on 07.04.2026 or any date thereafter as fixed by Trial Court for recording their statements qua the factum of compromise. The report regarding the factum of compromise, the number of accused arrayed, whether there is any other complainant or affected aggrieved party other than the respondents and whether any accused has been declared proclaimed offender was to be sent by this Court on or before 06.05.2026.

In this regard, it is submitted that on 16.04.2026 both the parties appeared before this court and moved joint application for recording their statements with regard to the compromise. statement of complainant Ravi, joint statement of all injured Narender, Rachna and Vivek and joint statement of accused persons namely Parveen Kumar, Amarjeet alias Billi son of Mukesh, Ansh alias Lucky and Amarjeet son of Naresh were recorded.

Complainant Ravi in his statement stated that he got lodged this case against accused persons namely Parveen Kumar Amarjeet



alias Billi son of Mukesh, Ansh alias Lucky and Amarjeet son of Naresh (present in the court). Accused have filed quashing petition with regard to present FIR. As per order dated 02.04.2026 passed in CRM-M-17261 of 2026 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court in case titled as 'Parveen Kumar and others vs. State of Haryana and others', he moved joint application for recording his statement before the Trial Court along with accused persons. He stated that he has entered into a compromise with accused without any pressure or coercion from any corner. The compromise is genuine and voluntary. He does not want to continue with any proceedings and has no grievance against the accused persons. He has no objection if the FIR in the present case is quashed.

Injured Narender, Rachna and Vivek also made joint statement to the effect that they all along with complainant Ravi have entered into a compromise with the accused (present in the Court) without any pressure or coercion from any corner. The compromise is genuine and voluntary. They do not want to continue with any proceedings and have no grievance against the accused persons. They have no objection if the FIR in the present case is quashed.

Accused persons namely Parveen Kumar, Amarjeet alias Billi son of Mukesh, Ansh alias Lucky and Amarjeet son of Naresh also made joint statement wherein they stated that FIR No.62 dated 08.03.2025 under Sections 190, 191(2), 191(3), 115(2), 126(2), 109, 351(3) BNS and 25(1-B), 25(1-C) of the Arms Act, Police Station Civil Line, Jind was registered against them on the complaint of complainant Ravi. They are facing trial in the above said case pending in this court for 07.07.2026 for prosecution evidence. They filed petition in the Hon'ble High Court of Punjab and Haryana for quashing above mentioned FIR. Vide order dated 02.04.2026 passed in CRM-M-17261 of 2026 by the Hon'ble High Court in case titled as 'Parveen Kumar and others vs. State of Haryana and Others', both the parties were directed to appear before the trial court on 07.04.2026 or any other other date for recording their statements with regard to their compromise. They stated that the compromise with the complainant and injured is voluntarily and without any coercion. They have not been declared proclaimed offender by any competent court of law.

Information from Investigating officer has also been sought. Investigating Officer SI Rajender, Police Station Civil Line Jind (now posted at Police Station City Jind) came present and made separate statement. As per the statement of Investigating Officer SI Rajender, there is no other accused in this case except petitioners namely Parveen, Ansh alias Lucky, Amarjeet son of Naresh and Amarjeet son of Mukesh.

There is no other complainant or affected/aggrieved party in this case except complainant namely Ravi and injured



Narender, Rachna and Vivek. Also, none of the accused has been declared as proclaimed offender.

From the statements of the parties and the statement of the Investigating Officer SI Rajender, Police Station Civil Line Jind (now posted at Police Station City Jind), it appears that the compromise is voluntary, without any force, coercion, undue influence and is genuine.”

4. Learned counsel for respondent Nos.2 to 5 admits the fact of parties having compromised and states that he has no objection in case the FIR and all proceedings subsequent thereto against the petitioners are quashed.

5. Similarly, learned State counsel has stated no objection in case the FIR is quashed based upon the compromise (Annexure P-2).

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.0062 dated 08.03.2025 under Sections 190, 191(2), 191(3), 115(2), 126(2), 109, 351(3) of BNS, and Section 25 (1)-B of Arms Act, Sections 190, 191(2), 191(3) of BNS have been deleted and Section 3(5) of BNS along with as well as Section 25(1)-C of Arms Act has been added, registered at Police Station Civil Line Jind, District Jind and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 12.03.2026 (Annexure P-2), are, hereby, quashed.

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

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

06.05.2026

jatin

Whether speaking/reasoned:
Whether reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No