



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

235

CRM-M-40435-2025
Date of Decision: 27.05.2026

MANDHIR SINGH AND OTHERS

...Petitioners

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Satnam Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Nishan Singh Chahal, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Vinay Malhotra, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Suraj Kaundal, Advocate for
Mr. H.R. Bhardwaj, Advocate for respondent No.2.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (ORAL)

1. Instant petition has been filed under Section 528 of BNSS, seeking quashing of the below detailed First Information Report (FIR), and all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of the compromise dated 13.06.2025 (Annexure P-2), effected between the parties.

DETAILS OF CRIMINAL CASE:-

FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station
70	04.06.2025	118(1), 115(2), 126(2), 351(2), 3(5) of BNS	Jaito, District Faridkot

2. Vide order dated 09.09.2025, 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.

3. Report has since been received from learned Sub Divisional



Judicial Magistrate, Jaitu, in pursuance to the directions of this Court wherein, the factum of the compromise arrived at between the parties stands verified and confirmed. As per the report(s) compromise has indeed been effected between the parties and the same is without any pressure or coercion and out of their free will and the private respondents have also made statement to the effect that they would have no objection if the FIR qua the accused-petitioners is quashed.

4. The trial Court has annexed the statements of the parties in original, along with its report. The relevant part of the said report is reproduced herebelow:

Sr. No.	Description	
1.	Total number of persons found involved as accused in the dispute/FIR	Four accused
2.	Number of complainant/victim(s)	One victim/complainant
3.	Whether all the accused and complainant / victims are party to compromise & signed the same	Yes
4.	In case, any affected person(accused or complainant) is left out or not arrayed as party in the quashing petition before High Court, detail whereas; Or His/her statement is till to be recorded, in compliance to the direction of this Court, details of such person	No complainant/accused has been left out in the petition and all have been arrayed as party in the petition.
5.	Whether any accused has been declared as a proclaimed offender/person or any such proceedings against him/her have been initiated or pending	No



	adjudication	
6.	Report of the Court whether compromise is genuine, voluntary, and without any coercion or undue influence	Yes
7.	Any other aspect relevant to the present case.	No

5. Learned State counsel too submits that there are no other accused other than the petitioner and the private respondents are the only aggrieved person in the FIR in question.

6. In view of the report of the learned Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Jaitu, and the principles laid down by Hon’ble the Apex Court in *Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab and others (2012) 10 SCC 303*, and also by the Full Bench of this Court in *Kulwinder Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and another, 2007(3) RCR (Criminal) 1052*, the instant petition is allowed. The aforesaid FIR and all consequential proceedings arising out of it, are quashed.

7. Needless to say the parties shall remain bound by the terms of compromise and their statements recorded before the Court below

8. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

May 27, 2026
Nisha-1

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