



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

316

CRM-M-38131-2025

SACHIN ALIAS ACHIN AND ANOTHER

....PETITIONERS

V/s

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

....RESPONDENTS

Date of decision: 22.01.2026

Date of Uploading:22.01.2026

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Chander Shekhar, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Deepak Kumar Grewal, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Ansal Jain, Advocate for respondent No.2.

SUMEET GOEL, J.

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023 for quashing of FIR No.0691 dated 29.11.2020 under Sections 323, 427, 436, 506 and 34 of IPC and Sections 25/54/59 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station Mujessasr, District Faridabad and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise (Annexure P-5), which is stated to have been effected between the parties.

2. On 11.11.2025, the following order was passed:

“The present petition under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023, is for quashing of FIR No.691 dated 29.11.2020, under Sections 323, 427, 436, 506, 34 of IPC and Sections 25/54/59 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station Mujessar, District Faridabad, along with all other consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise deed (Annexure P-5). Notice of motion.



On the asking of this Court, Mr. R.K. Singla, Addl. A.G., Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent No.1-State. Ms. Amarjeet Kaur, Advocate for Mr. Ansal Jain, Advocate for respondent No.2, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent No.2. She admitted the correctness of compromise and stated that she has no objection if this petition is allowed. Complete copy of paper book be supplied to them during the course of the day.

Let the parties be directed to appear before the learned trial court/Illaq Magistrate within four weeks and to get record their statements regarding compromise and after recording their statements, learned trial Court/Illaq Magistrate, is directed to send the same along with his report regarding the genuineness of compromise on or before the date fixed in the instant petition specifically with regard to the following facts : -

- 1. Number of persons arrayed as accused in the FIR.*
- 2. Whether any accused is proclaimed offender.*
- 3. Stage of the trial/proceedings.*
- 4. Whether the compromise is genuine, voluntary and without any coercion or undue influence.*

To come up on 15.12.2025 for awaiting the report.

A copy of this order be sent to the learned trial Court/Illaq Magistrate, through electronic mode, for compliance.”

3. Pursuant to the aforesaid order, report dated 03.12.2025 from Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Faridabad has been received, which is taken on record. As per the report, the Trial Court has recorded as follows:-

“1. As per the statement of Investigating Officer SI Mahesh Kumar, present case FIR No. 691 dated 29.11.2020, Police Station Mujessar, Faridabad was registered against three accused persons namely Sachin @ Achin son of Vijay Kumar, Manoj Kumar son of Bhagat Singh and Bhushan son of Ashok Kumar. Further as per the statement of Investigating Officer, accused Bhushan son of Ashok Kumar was found innocent during investigation and final report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. was filed against accused Sachin @Achin and Manoj Kumar.

2.As per the statement of Investigating Officer, no accused is proclaimed offender in the present case.

3. The present case is at the stage of prosecution evidence.

4. The compromise, so arrived at between the parties appears to be genuine, voluntarily and without any coercion or undue influence and out of their free will.”



4. Learned counsel for respondent No.2 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-5).

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.0691 dated 29.11.2020 under Sections 323, 427, 436, 506 and 34 of IPC and Sections 25/54/59 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station Mujessasr, District Faridabad and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise (Annexure P-5), are, hereby, quashed.

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

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

22.01.2026
jatin

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