



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

CRM-M-28466-2025

Date of Decision: 27.04.2026

PUNIT KAUSHIK AND OTHERS

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present: Mr. Puneet Malik, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Ms. Geeta Rani, AAG, Haryana.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J. (Oral)

The prayer in this petition is for quashing of FIR No.111 dated 09.03.2023 under Sections 147, 148, 149, 323, 325, 427 and 506 of IPC (Section 307 and 120-B IPC was added later on and Sections 147, 148, 149 and 427 of IPC were deleted) registered at Police Station City Sohna, District Gurugram, Haryana and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 13.05.2025 (Annexure P-2).

Vide order dated 14.10.2025, this Court had directed the parties to appear before Illaqa Magistrate for getting their statements recorded in terms of certain parameters given in the aforesaid order dated 14.10.2025 with regard to the compromise (Annexure P-2).

In terms of the order dated 14.10.2025 passed by this Court, the parties have appeared before the court of the Additional District & Sessions Judge, Gurugram and as per the report dated 11.11.2025 submitted to this Court, both the parties have got recorded their respective statements

A perusal of the aforesaid report would show that the parties have effected a genuine compromise without there being any pressure, coercion or undue influence. In view of the compromise there is a remote possibility of the complainant coming forward to support the prosecution case. The powers under Section 482 Cr.PC can be exercised in such like situation in order to prevent unnecessary vagaries of criminal trial to be faced by the parties, when there are remote chances of conviction of the accused. The compromise in question is found to be fully in consonance with the direction issued by the Court in ***Kulwinder Singh & Ors. Vs. State of Punjab 2007(3) RCR (Criminal) 1052 and Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab & Anr., 2012(4) RCR (Crl.) 543.***

In the present case, undoubtedly, the FIR has been registered under Section 307 IPC and therefore, the question would be as to whether the FIR could be quashed.

This Court was informed by the learned counsel for the petitioner that it is a case of no injury, which fact has been admitted by the learned counsel for respondent Nos.2 to 7 as also the State counsel.

The Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Narinder Singh and Others vs State of Punjab and Another, 2014 (2) RCR (Criminal) 482, and State of Madhya Pradesh vs Laxmi Narayan and Others, 2019(2) RCR (Criminal) 255**, have categorized those cases where quashing on the basis of compromise was permitted and those in which, it was not permitted. It was further observed that the Court concerned may look into the medical evidence and examine the same to see as to whether the conviction under Section 307 of the IPC was possible or not.

Thus, mere registration of an FIR under Section 307 did not foreclose the right of the petitioner/accused to effect a compromise and get the FIR quashed.

In the present case, as is apparent, it is a case of no injury. Hence, with a view to put a quietus to the incident between the parties, it would be in the interest of justice to quash the proceedings on the basis of compromise as the possibility of a conviction being recorded under Section 307 IPC is extremely unlikely.

In view of the above, the present petition is allowed. FIR No.111 dated 09.03.2023 under Sections 147, 148, 149, 323, 325, 427 and 506 of IPC (Section 307 and 120-B IPC was added later on and Sections 147, 148, 149 and 427 of IPC were deleted) registered at Police Station City Sohna, District Gurugram, Haryana along with all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom are hereby quashed on the basis of a compromise dated 13.05.2025 (Annexures P-2).

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

April 27, 2026

vishal

Whether speaking/reasoned:- Yes/No

Whether reportable:- Yes/No