



CRM-M-28007-20251

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

341

CRM-M-28007-2025

Decided on: January 22, 2026

Ravi Pal Singh and others
.....Petitioners
Versus
State of Punjab and another
.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. R.S. Dhillon, Advocate,
for Mr. Parteek Pandit, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. Vinay Malhotra, DAG, Punjab,
for respondent No. 1.

Mr. Barjinder Singh, Advocate, for respondent No. 2.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. Instant petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. (now Section 528 of the BNSS, 2023) seeking quashing of the below detailed First Information Report (FIR), and all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of the compromise dated 22.04.2025 (Annexure P-2), effected between the parties.

DETAILS OF CRIMINAL CASE:-

FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
92	07.04.2025	115(2), 118(1), 109, 190, 191(3) of BNS, 2023, and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act	City, Kapurthala	Kapurthala

2. Vide order dated 21.05.2025, passed by this Court, the affected parties were directed to appear before the learned Trial



Court/Illaq Magistrate, for getting their respective statements recorded with regard to the compromise. The Trial Court/Illaq Magistrate was to submit a report in this regard giving certain details as enumerated in the said order.

3. In compliance of the order dated 21.05.2025, a report dated 17.07.2025, was received from the court of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Kapurthala. On 20.08.2025, after perusing the said report, this Court passed the following order:

“ In compliance of Order dated 21.05.2025, passed by this Court, all the affected parties appeared before learned trial Court for recording their respective statements. In compliance thereto after recording the statements, learned CJM, Kapurthala vide letter dated 17.07.2025 has submitted the report before this Court. After perusal of the report, it has been observed that although all the affected parties have entered into compromise, however, there are total 14 accused but 13 accused have recorded their statements, as one of the accused namely Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi being 14th accused expired during the proceedings.

Moreover, it is not clear whether the statements of all the 13 accused/petitioners herein have been recorded or not, because the statements appended with the report are only of seven of the petitioners. Let the said confusion be removed by calling a fresh report from the concerned Magistrate in regard to the statements.

Awaiting fresh report 29.10.2025.

Let copy of the order be forwarded to the concerned trial Court.”

Thereafter, vide letter dated 28.10.2025, received from the court of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Kapurthala, it has been reported that statements of all the 13 petitioners and respondent were recorded and submitted with the report on 17.07.2025, through email dated 18.07.2025. Copy of report dated 17.07.2025 alongwith copies of all the statements have also been received alongwith letter dated 28.10.2025.



4. From the report received from the learned court below, it is evident that FIR in the present case was registered against 14 accused. One of the accused, namely, Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi died on 21.04.2025. Thus, the present petition has been filed by remaining 13 accused, who are petitioners before this Court. Further, in para No. 5 of the report dated 17.07.2025, it has been stated as under:-

“5) Therefore, on the basis of the statements made by both the parties and the Investigating officer it is clear that the compromise effected between the parties is genuine, voluntary and without any coercion or undue influence. Further the point wise information as requisitioned is as under:

Sr. No.	Information Required
I	<i>As per the statement of Investigating Officer, the FIR was registered against fourteen accused namely:- No.1) Ravi Pal Singh S/o Vijay Kumar No.2) Navjot Singh s/o Malkit Singh No.3) Lovepreet Singh @ Labha S/o Joginder No.4) Karan Kumar S/o Ashok Kumar No.5) Jagjot Singh @ Jagga S/o Malkit Singh No.6) Mani @ Maan S/o Lali No.7) Rahul @ Dhunni 5/o Ranjit Singh No.8) Vishal S/o Ranjit Singh No.9) Manav @ Mana S/o Harmesh Kumar No.10) Jasvir Singh @ Vansh s/o Soni @ Sonu No.11) Ashwani Kumar @ Ashu s/o Lali, No.12) Rajat s/o Bala, No.13) Ajaydeep Singh @ Ajay s/o Nirmal Singh, No.14) Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi s/o Balwinder Singh, however petitioner namely 14) Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi died on 21.04.2025</i>
II	<i>As per the statement of Investigating Officer, there is only one complainant namely:- No.2) Sunil Kumar S/o Amarjit Singh</i>
III	<i>As per the statement of the Investigating Officer, all the accused and complainant are party to the compromise and signed the same except the accused namely Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi as he died on 21.04.2025.</i>
IV	<i>As per the statement of the Investigating Officer, there is no other complainant/victim or affected</i>



	<i>person arrayed as party in the present petition except the complainant namely Sunil Kumar. However there is one accused namely Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi who is not arrayed as party in the present petition as he died on 21.04.2025.</i>
V	<i>As per the statement of Investigating Officer, the accused persons were not declared Proclaimed Offender and no PO proceedings were initiated or pending against any of the accused.</i>
VI	<i>As per the statement of both the parties, the compromise effected between them is genuine, voluntary and without any coercion or undue influence.</i>
VII	<i>As per the statement of Investigating Officer, one accused namely Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi died on 21.04.2025 who is not party to the present petition.”</i>

5. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that in view of the report received from the Court of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Kapurthala, it is evident that the matter has been resolved and private parties have effected a compromise, and there remains no dispute amongst them requiring any adjudication. Further submits that in view of the compromise so effected between the private parties, pendency of the FIR and consequential proceedings emanating therefrom would be sheer abuse of the process of law, and the same can be quashed.

6. Further, learned State counsel as well as learned counsel for respondent No. 2, after going through the statements and the report received from learned Court below, very fairly admit that the private parties have resolved their dispute and effected a compromise and that he has no objection if the FIR (supra) and all the consequential proceedings are quashed on the basis of the compromise.

7. Through catena of judgments, Hon’ble the Apex Court and High Courts (including Punjab and Haryana High Court), have culled out various principles of law concerning quashing of proceedings emanating after lodging of FIR, and some of them are as under:-

- *Power under Section 482 Cr.P.C./Section 582 BNSS can be exercised to enhance social amity, and to reduce friction.*



- *Disputes which have their genesis in a matrimonial discord, landlord-tenant matters, commercial transactions and other such matters can safely be dealt with by the Court by exercising its powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C./Section 582 BNSS in the event of a compromise, but this is not to say that the power is limited to such cases.*
- *There can never be any hard and fast category which can be prescribed to enable the Court to exercise its power under Section 482 Cr.P.C./Section 582 BNSS "to prevent abuse of the process of any Court" or "to secure the ends of justice".*
- *No embargo, be in the shape of Section 320(9) Cr.P.C./Section 359 BNSS, or any other such curtailment, can whittle down the power under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C./Section 582 of the BNSS.*
- *The compromise, in a modern society, is the sine qua non of harmony and orderly behaviour.*
- *High Court has the wide power to quash the proceedings even in non-compoundable offences notwithstanding the bar under Section 320 Cr.P.C./Section 359 BNSS, in order to prevent the abuse of law and to secure the ends of justice.*
- *Power under Section 482 Cr.P.C./Section 582 BNSS is to be exercised Ex-Debitia Justitia to prevent an abuse of process of Court.*
- *Such power has no limits. However, the High Court will exercise it sparingly and with utmost care and caution.*
- *The exercise of power has to be with circumspection and restraint.*
- *The Court is a vital and an extra-ordinary effective instrument to maintain and control social order.*
- *The Courts play role of paramount importance in achieving peace, harmony and ever-lasting congeniality in society.*
- *Resolution of a dispute by way of a compromise between two warring groups, therefore, should attract the immediate and prompt attention of a Court which should endeavour to give full effect to the same unless such compromise is abhorrent to lawful composition of the society or would promote savagery.*
- *Matters which can be categorized as personal in nature or where nature of injuries do not exhibit mental depravity or involves commission of an offence of such a serious nature that quashing of FIR would override the public interest, the Court can quash the FIR in view of the settlement arrived at amongst the parties.*



In this regard, judgments cited are:

1. Gian Singh v. State of Punjab and another, (2012) 10 SCC 303 (SC);
2. Parbatbhai Aahir @ Parbatbhai Bhimsinhbhai Karmur and others v. State of Gujarat and another, (2017) 9 SCC 641 (SC);
3. Ramgopal and another v. State of Madhya Pradesh, 2021 SCC Online SC 834 (SC); and
4. Kulwinder Singh and others v. State of Punjab and another, 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052 [P&H FB]

8. After hearing learned State counsel and going through the material available on record, this Court finds that there appears to be substance in the prayer made in the instant petition that pendency of the present criminal litigation would be abuse of process of law since the chances of conviction of the petitioners are bleak in view of the compromise, so effected between the private parties.

9. The report alongwith statements of the affected parties received from learned Court below would reveal that the complainant/victim person(s) have genuinely effected a compromise with the petitioners and they have no objection, if the impugned FIR and consequential proceedings are quashed.

10. Keeping in view the totality of the facts and circumstances of the case, including the report received by this Court and also, taking into consideration the aforementioned settled principles of law, this petition is accepted and **FIR (as detailed in para No. 1 above) and all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom** are hereby quashed *qua* the petitioners, in view of compromise dated 22.04.2025 (Annexure P-2).

11. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

January 22, 2026

Pkapor

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO

Whether Reportable: YES/NO