



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

279

CRM-M-22012-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 21.01.2026

Gurpreet Singh and others

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Punjab and others

...Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present :- Ms. Kamaldeep Kaur, Advocate for
Mr. D.S. Gandhi, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Saurav Verma, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

Ms. Kashish Mehta, Advocate for
Mr. J.S. Dadwal, Advocate for respondents No.2 to 9.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in the instant petition is for quashing of GDR No.030 dated 28.04.2024 under Sections 323, 324, 506, 148, 149 of the IPC (Sections 325 and 326 of the IPC added later on) in FIR No.0034 dated 28.04.2024 under Sections 452, 307, 324, 323, 506, 160, 148, 149 of the IPC (Section 326 added later on) registered at Police Station Daba, District Ludhiana, along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 04.02.2025 (Annexure P-3).

2. Succinctly, facts of the present case are that on 27.04.2024, complainant- Pritam Singh was going back to his house on motorcycle with his friend Ramesh Kumar. At about 9:00 pm, when they reached in front of liquor vend on Star Road, one White colour AURA car which was parked on



the lower side of the road, was suddenly brought in front of their motorcycle whereupon 7 unknown persons alighted from the car and started beating the complainant. They snatched complainant's bag and Rs.50,000 from his shirt's pocket. After enquiring about the car, the complainant went to the car rider's house where he was attacked with a sword on his head. Upon sustaining the head injury, he informed his son who reached at the spot. However, by that time the car rider had called 20 more boys who were carrying deadly weapons and they caused injuries to complainant and his son.

3. However, with the intervention of the respectables, the parties have decided to compromise the matter. Hence, the present petition.

4. The parties were directed to appear before the learned trial Court/Illaq Magistrate vide order dated 10.07.2025 of this Court, to get their statements recorded regarding the compromise arrived at between the parties and a report in this regard was called for.

5. Pursuant to the said order, report has been received from the Additional Sessions Judge, Ludhiana vide Memo No. 285 dated 06.09.2025.

The relevant extract of the report is reproduced as under:-

“(i) Name of Complainant is Pritam Singh and names of accused Gurpreet Singh, Manpreet Singh and Baljit Singh alias Lucky. In the present GDR Complainant as well as injured and eye witness and all accused have suffered separate similar statements that compromise has been effected between them.



(ii) Complainant, injured eye witnesses as well as Investigating Officer have deposed that none of the accused had been declared proclaimed offender.

(iii) Investigating Report has reported that till date Challan has not been filed in Cross Case. Thus matter is pending under investigation.

(iv) In view of the statements suffered by Complainant injured and eye witnesses as well as accused persons narrated above it is apparent that compromise between the parties is genuine voluntarily and out of free will as they had entered into said compromise without pressure, voluntarily and out of their free will to settle the dispute and to ensure that peace prevails between them in coming future and Complainant party left with no grudge against accused party.

(v) Investigating Officer has got recorded his statement that none of the accused in present Cross case lodged on GDR has any criminal antecedents. All accused Gurpreet Singh, Manpreet Singh and Baljit Singh have got recorded that except the present GDR no other FIR is pending or registered against them.

Accordingly it is submitted that Compromise has been effected between parties and they have entered in genuine Compromise voluntarily and out of free will .The report is



being submitted alongwith the statements of parties as well as Investigating Officer recorded by the court.”

6. Learned State counsel does not dispute the factum of the compromise amongst the parties and does not have any serious objection to the resolution of the dispute amongst the parties.

7. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondents No. 2 to 9 reiterates the settlement and her concurrence to the FIR and all the other consequential proceedings being quashed.

8. The broad principles for exercising the powers under Section 482 were summarized by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of **'Parbatbhai Aahir @ Parbatbhai Bhimsinhbhai Karmur and others versus State of Gujarat and another' (2017) 9 SCC 641'**. The relevant paragraphs are extracted as under:

“16.1. Section 482 preserves the inherent powers of the High Court to prevent an abuse of the process of any court or to secure the ends of justice. The provision does not confer new powers. It only recognises and preserves powers which inhere in the High Court.

16.2. The invocation of the jurisdiction of the High Court to quash a first information report or a criminal proceeding on the ground that a settlement has been arrived at between the offender and the victim is not the same as the invocation of jurisdiction for the purpose of compounding an offence. While compounding an offence,



the power of the court is governed by the provisions of Section 320 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973. The power to quash under Section 482 is attracted even if the offence is non-compoundable.

16.3. In forming an opinion whether a criminal proceeding or complaint should be quashed in exercise of its jurisdiction under Section 482, the High Court must evaluate whether the ends of justice would justify the exercise of the inherent power.

16.4. While the inherent power of the High Court has a wide ambit and plenitude it has to be exercised (i) to secure the ends of justice, or (ii) to prevent an abuse of the process of any court.

16.5. The decision as to whether a complaint or first information report should be quashed on the ground that the offender and victim have settled the dispute, revolves ultimately on the facts and circumstances of each case and no exhaustive elaboration of principles can be formulated.

16.6. In the exercise of the power under Section 482 and while dealing with a plea that the dispute has been settled, the High Court must have due regard to the nature and gravity of the offence. Heinous and serious offences involving mental depravity or offences such as murder,



rape and dacoity cannot appropriately be quashed though the victim or the family of the victim have settled the dispute. Such offences are, truly speaking, not private in nature but have a serious impact upon society. The decision to continue with the trial in such cases is founded on the overriding element of public interest in punishing persons for serious offences.

16.7. As distinguished from serious offences, there may be criminal cases which have an overwhelming or predominant element of a civil dispute. They stand on a distinct footing insofar as the exercise of the inherent power to quash is concerned.

16.8. Criminal cases involving offences which arise from commercial, financial, mercantile, partnership or similar transactions with an essentially civil flavour may in appropriate situations fall for quashing where parties have settled the dispute.

16.9. In such a case, the High Court may quash the criminal proceeding if in view of the compromise between the disputants, the possibility of a conviction is remote and the continuation of a criminal proceeding would cause oppression and prejudice; and

16.10. There is yet an exception to the principle set out in propositions 16.8. and 16.9. above. Economic offences



279

CRM-M-22012-2025 (O&M)

involving the financial and economic well-being of the State have implications which lie beyond the domain of a mere dispute between private disputants. The High Court would be justified in declining to quash where the offender is involved in an activity akin to a financial or economic fraud or misdemeanour. The consequences of the act complained of upon the financial or economic system will weigh in the balance.”

9. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has held in '**Ramgopal And Another Vs State of Madhya Pradesh**, 2021 SCC Online SC 834', that the matters which can be categorized as personal in nature or in the matter in which the nature of injuries do not exhibit mental depravity or commission of an offence of such a serious nature that quashing of which would override public interest, the Court can quash the FIR in view of the settlement arrived at amongst the parties.

10. It is evident that in view of the amicable resolution of the issues amongst the parties, no useful purpose would be served by continuation of the proceedings. The furtherance of the proceedings is likely to be a waste of judicial time and there appears to be no chances of conviction.

11. The following relevant factors emerge from perusal of the case as well as the subsequent developments supplementing a case for invocation of the powers under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita,

2023:-



- i) *It is a case of version and cross-version wherein both sides have levelled allegations against each other, thereby reflecting a mutual altercation rather than a one-sided criminal act;*
- ii) *Petitioner(s) no. 1, 2 and 3 are of 35, 33 and 39 years of age respectively and continued criminal incarceration will cause severe repercussions to the petitioner in discharge of his social obligations as well as in his work place.*
- iii) *The FIR in question pertains to the year 2024 and the proceedings are at an early stage.*
- iv) *The offence in question cannot be said to be heinous or as an offence that would shock the conscience of the society or public at large. It can also not be termed as one shocking to the conscience of the Court;*
- v) *In view of the version and cross version, the likelihood of the complainant supporting the prosecution case is remote and the probability of securing a conviction is bleak;*
- vi) *Continuation of the proceedings with the complainant unlikely to support the case of the prosecution, would serve no larger public purpose and only result in futile expenditure of judicial time.*

12. In view of the report of the Additional District Judge, Ludhiana and the principles laid down by the Apex Court in '**Parbatbhai Aahir @**



Parbatbhai Bhimsinhbhai Karmur and others versus State of Gujarat and another” (2017) 9 SCC 641', the instant petition is allowed. GDR No.030 dated 28.04.2024 under Sections 323, 324, 506, 148, 149 of the IPC (Sections 325 and 326 of the IPC added later on) in FIR No.0034 dated 28.04.2024 under Sections 452, 307, 324, 323, 506, 160, 148, 149 of the IPC(Section 326 added later on) registered at Police Station Daba, District Ludhiana, along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, are hereby quashed qua the petitioner(s) on the basis of compromise dated 04.02.2025 (Annexure P-3).

13. Petition is *allowed*.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

21.01.2026

Mangal Singh

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