



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

320

**CRM-M No.28302 of 2024
Date of decision : 10.3.2026
Date of uploading : 11.3.2026**

Vineet Kohli @ Veneet Kohli and anotherPetitioners

Versus

Vageesh Kumar BhardwajRespondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Ajay Kumar Dahiya, Advocate, for the petitioners

Mr. Akashdeep Singh, Advocate, for the respondent

SUMEET GOEL, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. for setting aside the impugned order dated 10.4.2024 (Annexure P-12) passed by the Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Sonipat, whereby the SHO concerned was directed to register FIR on the complaint of respondent no.2-complainant; and also for setting aside the impugned order dated 16.2.2024 (Annexure P-11) passed in CRR No.8 of 2023 titled **Vageesh Kumar v. Vineet Kohli and another** by the Additional Sessions Judge, Sonipat, whereby the order dated 22.12.2023 passed by the learned trial Court was set aside and the learned trial Court was directed to consider the application filed under Section 154(3) of Cr.P.C. Further prayer of the petitioner is for issuing directions to stay the operation of the above mentioned impugned orders dated 10.4.2024 (Annexure P-12) and dated



16.2.2024 (Annexure P-11)

2. On 09.02.2026, the following order was passed:

“Application (CRM-5886-2026) is for placing on record a copy of compromise deed dated 04.02.2026 effected among all the parties involved in the present case.

Learned counsel for the rival parties, during course of hearing, submit that the parties have amicably settled the dispute and the same has been reduced into a written compromise deed dated 04.02.2026.

*Learned counsel for the applicant-petitioners 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 **CRM-M No.48043 of 2023, titled Rakesh Das v. State of Haryana and another**, decided on 12.11.2024.*

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

(i) They shall appear before the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate concerned on 19.02.2026 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/Illaqa Magistrate.

After recording the statements of all the affected parties in either of the aforesaid manner, the trial Court/Illaqa 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/Illaqa 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. 10.03.2026.”

3. Pursuant to the aforesaid order, report dated 27.02.2026 from Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Sonipat has been received, which is taken on record. As per the report, the Trial Court has recorded as follows:-

- “(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?*
- In respect of the first, second and third information as sought by the Hon'ble High Court, it is humbly submitted that as per record and Statement of Investigating Officer PSI Surender, posted at Police*



Station Bahalgarh, Sonapat, recorded separately, in the present case, FIR has not been registered as there was stay from the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court. The compromise has been effected between the parties on 04.02.2026 with the intervention of respectable person. It is further stated that there is one complainant/victim/affected person namely Vageesh Kumar Bhardwaj S/o Anand Kumar and there are only two accused named in the complaint namely Vineet Kohli S/o Brij Mohan and Smt. Anju Kohli W/o Vineet Kohli. No other accused is involved in the present case. Accused is neither proclaimed offender in the present case.

It is further submitted that in pursuance of order of the Hon'ble High Court, complainant Vageesh Kumar Bhardwaj and accused Vineet Kohli and Smt. Anju Kohli have appeared before the Court on 19.02.2026. Complainant Vageesh Kumar Bhardwaj, duly identified by his counsel, suffered a statement to the effect that he is complainant in the present complaint bearing complaint No. COMI-304-2022, Police Station Bahalgarh, Sonipat. The compromise has been effected between the parties on 04.02.2026. He has entered into the compromise voluntarily and the compromise has been effected between the parties amicably, without undue influence or coercion and he has received the pending amount i.e. 1,50,000/- through DD No. 271356 dated 31.01.2026. He has received full compensation amount as per compromise deed dated 04.02.2026. There is no grievance left against the accused or any other person in the matter. There is no other aggrieved person in the present case.

Accused Vineet Kohli has also suffered separate statement to the effect that he is accused in the present complaint bearing complaint No. COMI-304-2022, Police Station Bahalgarh, Sonipat. The compromise has been effected between the parties on 04.02.2026 with the intervention of respectable person. He has entered into the compromise voluntarily and the compromise has been effected between the parties amicably, without undue influence or coercion. He has not been declared Proclaimed Offender in present case and no other criminal case is pending against me. He has paid the pending amount i.e. 1,50,000/- through DD No. 271356 dated 31.01.2026. He has paid full compensation amount as per compromise deed dated 04.02.2026.

Accused Smt. Anju Kohli has also suffered separate statement to the



effect that she is accused in the present complaint bearing complaint No.COMI-304-2022, Police Station Bahalgarh, Sonipat. The compromise has been effected between the parties on 04.02.2026 with the intervention of respectable person. She has entered into the compromise voluntarily and the compromise has been effected between the parties amicably, without undue influence or coercion. She has not been declared Proclaimed Offender in present case and no other criminal case is pending against me. She has paid the pending amount i.e. 1,50,000/- through DD No. 271356 dated 31.01.2026. She has paid full compensation amount as per compromise deed dated 04.02.2026.

Being satisfied that the statements were being voluntarily made, statements of both the parties were recorded on oath, wherein they have acknowledged of having entered into compromise. In view of the statements of interested parties, this court is satisfied that the compromise has been arrived between the parties and the said compromise is valid, without any coercion or undue influence. Statement of the parties and Investigating Officer in original are attached.”

4. I have heard learned Counsel for the parties and have carefully gone through the records of the case.

5. 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.*

6. 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 482 of Cr.P.C. to quash the impugned orders:

Putting a quietus to the proceedings will bring peace and tranquility amongst parties & will accordingly further the cause of substantial justice



- (i) The offences alleged are primarily of private nature.*
- (ii) The parties have compromised.*
- (iii) As per the report received the compromise is said to be voluntary in its nature.*
- (iv) Complainant/victim is reported to have entered into compromise on his own volition.*

7. Consequently, the petition is disposed of. Impugned order dated 10.4.2024 (Annexure P-12) passed by the Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Sonipat, whereby the SHO concerned was directed to register FIR on the complaint of respondent no.2-complainant; and impugned order dated 16.2.2024 (Annexure P-11) passed in CRR No.8 of 2023 titled **Vageesh Kumar v. Vineet Kohli and another**’ by the Additional Sessions Judge, Sonipat, whereby the order dated 22.12.2023 passed by the learned trial Court was set aside, are hereby quashed, on the basis of compromise deed dated 4.2.2026 (Annexure P-13) affected between the parties.

8. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

10.3.2026
Ashwani

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