



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

296

CRM-M-51447-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 15.01.2026

Beant Singh Sidhu and others

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Punjab and another

...Respondent(s)

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ**

Present :- Mr. P.S. Dhaliwal, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Rituraj Singh, DAG Punjab.

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

\*\*\*\*\*

**VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)**

1. Prayer in the present petition is for seeking quashing of FIR No.0106 dated 31.07.2025 registered under Sections 115(2), 118(1), 126(2), 351(2), 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Section 25 of the Arms Act at Police Station Dhanaula, District Barnala (Annexure P-1) along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 29.08.2025 (Annexure P-2).

2. Briefly summarized, the facts of the present case are that on 31.07.2025, the respondent-complainant, Dharminder Singh, had been going towards the fields on foot, following the tractor, which was being driven by his servant. At about 9:00 PM, when they were passing the house of their neighbour Beant Singh (petitioner No.1), the latter started abusing the servant and when the complainant stopped him from doing so, he was beaten



up by Beant Singh. Beant Singh then called his son, Jaskaran Singh (petitioner No. 2), and his nephew, Princedeeep Singh (petitioner No. 3). Jaskaran had a gandasa in his hand, while Princedeeep had an iron rod. The trio surrounded the complainant; Beant Singh caught hold of his right arm; Jaskaran Singh gave him a gandasa blow on the forehead, and Princedeeep Singh gave an iron rod blow on the side of his forehead. Princedeeep Singh again gave an iron rod blow on the complainant's right hip, due to which he fell down. Then, Darshan Singh (petitioner No. 4), along with the other petitioners, gave the complainant fist and kick blows. The complainant then raised a hue and cry and the petitioners ran away from the spot. The present FIR was thus registered against the petitioners.

3. However, with the intervention of the respectables, the parties have decided to compromise the matter. Hence, the present petition.

4. The parties were directed to appear before the learned trial Court/Illaq Magistrate vide order dated 15.09.2025 of this Court, to get their statements recorded regarding the compromise arrived at between the parties and a report in this regard was called for.

5. Pursuant to the said order, a report has been received from the Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Barnala vide Memo No. 1154 dated 14.11.2025. The relevant extract of the report is reproduced as under:-

*“(I) There are four accused persons arrayed in the FIR namely Beant Singh Sidhu, Jaskaran Singh, Princedeeep Singh and Darshan Singh.*

*(II) There is only one complainant/victim in this case.*



(III) *Yes, all the accused, complainant/victim are party to the compromise.*

(IV) *No one is left out.*

(V) *As per statement of Investigating Officer, no accused has been declared as proclaimed person.*

(VI) *As per the statements of parties, compromise between the parties is genuine, voluntary, and without any coercion or undue influence.*

(VIII) *Nothing more is relevant to mention here.”*

6. Reply filed by way of affidavit dated 26.11.2025 on behalf of respondent-State is already available on file and the same is taken on record.

7. Learned State counsel does not dispute the factum of the compromise amongst the parties and does not have any serious objection to the resolution of the dispute amongst the parties.

8. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent No. 2 reiterates the settlement and his concurrence to the FIR and all the other consequential proceedings being quashed and affirmed during the statement before the trial Court.

9. The broad principles for exercising the powers under Section 482 were summarized by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of ***'Parbatbhai Aahir @ Parbatbhai Bhimsinhbhai Karmur and others versus State of Gujarat and another'* (2017) 9 SCC 641'**. The relevant paragraphs are extracted as under:



**“16.1.** *Section 482 preserves the inherent powers of the High Court to prevent an abuse of the process of any court or to secure the ends of justice. The provision does not confer new powers. It only recognises and preserves powers which inhere in the High Court.*

**16.2.** *The invocation of the jurisdiction of the High Court to quash a first information report or a criminal proceeding on the ground that a settlement has been arrived at between the offender and the victim is not the same as the invocation of jurisdiction for the purpose of compounding an offence. While compounding an offence, the power of the court is governed by the provisions of Section 320 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973. The power to quash under Section 482 is attracted even if the offence is non-compoundable.*

**16.3.** *In forming an opinion whether a criminal proceeding or complaint should be quashed in exercise of its jurisdiction under Section 482, the High Court must evaluate whether the ends of justice would justify the exercise of the inherent power.*

**16.4.** *While the inherent power of the High Court has a wide ambit and plenitude it has to be exercised (i) to secure the ends of justice, or (ii) to prevent an abuse of the process of any court.*



**16.5.** *The decision as to whether a complaint or first information report should be quashed on the ground that the offender and victim have settled the dispute, revolves ultimately on the facts and circumstances of each case and no exhaustive elaboration of principles can be formulated.*

**16.6.** *In the exercise of the power under Section 482 and while dealing with a plea that the dispute has been settled, the High Court must have due regard to the nature and gravity of the offence. Heinous and serious offences involving mental depravity or offences such as murder, rape and dacoity cannot appropriately be quashed though the victim or the family of the victim have settled the dispute. Such offences are, truly speaking, not private in nature but have a serious impact upon society. The decision to continue with the trial in such cases is founded on the overriding element of public interest in punishing persons for serious offences.*

**16.7.** *As distinguished from serious offences, there may be criminal cases which have an overwhelming or predominant element of a civil dispute. They stand on a distinct footing insofar as the exercise of the inherent power to quash is concerned.*

**16.8.** *Criminal cases involving offences which arise from*



*commercial, financial, mercantile, partnership or similar transactions with an essentially civil flavour may in appropriate situations fall for quashing where parties have settled the dispute.*

**16.9.** *In such a case, the High Court may quash the criminal proceeding if in view of the compromise between the disputants, the possibility of a conviction is remote and the continuation of a criminal proceeding would cause oppression and prejudice; and*

**16.10.** *There is yet an exception to the principle set out in propositions 16.8. and 16.9. above. Economic offences involving the financial and economic well-being of the State have implications which lie beyond the domain of a mere dispute between private disputants. The High Court would be justified in declining to quash where the offender is involved in an activity akin to a financial or economic fraud or misdemeanour. The consequences of the act complained of upon the financial or economic system will weigh in the balance.”*

10. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has held in '**Ramgopal And Another Vs State of Madhya Pradesh**, 2021 SCC Online SC 834', that the matters which can be categorized as personal in nature or in the matter in which the nature of injuries do not exhibit mental depravity or commission



of an offence of such a serious nature that quashing of which would override public interest, the Court can quash the FIR in view of the settlement arrived at amongst the parties.

11. The following relevant factors emerge from perusal of the case as well as the subsequent developments supplementing a case for invocation of the powers under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023: -

- i) *The dispute between the petitioners and the respondent-complainant arose since the latter had been raising a pillar by leaving the joint wall and had been putting sand towards the house of petitioner No.1.*
- ii) *Petitioners are 47, 21, 18 and 73 years of age respectively and continued criminal incarceration will cause severe repercussions to the petitioners in discharge of their social obligations as well as in their workplace.*
- iii) *The FIR in question pertains to the year 2025 and the proceedings are still at an early stage.*
- iv) *The offence in question cannot be said to be heinous or as an offence that would shock the conscience of the society or public at large. It can also not be termed as one shocking to the conscience of the Court;*
- v) *Continuation of the proceedings with the complainant unlikely to support the case of the prosecution, would serve no larger public purpose and only result in futile*



*expenditure of judicial time.*

12. In view of the report of the Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Barnala and the principles laid down by the Apex Court in '**Parbatbhai Aahir @ Parbatbhai Bhimsinhbhai Karmur and others versus State of Gujarat and another**' (2017) 9 SCC 641', the instant petition is allowed. FIR No.0106 dated 31.07.2025 registered under Sections 115(2), 118(1), 126(2), 351(2), 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Section 25 of the Arms Act at Police Station Dhanaula, District Barnala (Annexure P-1) along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, are hereby quashed qua the petitioner(s) on the basis of compromise dated 29.08.2025 (Annexure P-2).

13. Petition is **allowed**.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)  
JUDGE

15.01.2026

Mangal Singh

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