



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

**CRM-M-52203-2025
Date of decision: 14.05.2026**

MANJOT SINGH ALIAS JYOTI AND OTHERS

...PETITIONERS

V/S

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present: Mr. Dinesh Maurya, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Ms. Navreet K. Barnala, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Rajeev Kumar, Advocate for
Mr. Mayank Aggarwal, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in this petition is for quashing of FIR No.112 dated 30.07.2022 under Sections 323, 324, 341, 148, 149 and 506 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 registered at Police Station Sadar Patiala, District Patiala and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 21.05.2025 (Annexure P-2) arrived at between the parties.
2. The above stated FIR was registered on the statement of the complainant/respondent No.2-Kabal Singh.
3. On notice of motion, respondent No.2 appeared in the Court through his counsel and pleaded that he has no objection if the FIR in this case is quashed on the basis of the aforesaid compromise, which has been effected between the parties.



4. During the course of preliminary hearing, the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate was directed to record the statements of the all the concerned parties with regard to genuineness and validity or otherwise of the aforesaid compromise, subject to deposit of Rs.10,000/- each by the petitioners.

5. In compliance thereof, cost has been deposited and the receipts regarding the same have also been placed on record and report from the Court of learned Additional District & Sessions Judge, Patiala along with statements of the parties has been received, in which, it is mentioned that the compromise is genuine and there was no undue influence or coercion from any side.

6. Short reply dated 25.01.2026 filed by way of affidavit of Harsimran Singh, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Rural, District Patiala on behalf of respondent-State is taken on record.

7. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties.

8. Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) and for respondent No.2 are *ad idem* that in view of the settlement effected between the parties, the present petition deserves to be accepted. It has also come on record that the aforesaid compromise is genuine and the parties effected the same without any undue influence or coercion.

9. In view of above, nothing remains to be adjudicated further in the present case. Thus, continuation of the criminal proceedings between the parties would be a futile exercise and sheer wastage of time of the Court and thus, amounts to abuse of process of law.

10. For the reasons afore-stated and having regard to the law laid down by Hon'ble Apex Court in ***Gian Singh v. State of Punjab and another, 2012 (4) RCR (Criminal) 543*** and Five Judges Bench of this Court in



Kulwinder Singh and others v. State of Punjab and another, 2007(3) RCR (Criminal) 1052, this petition is allowed and FIR No.112 dated 30.07.2022 under Sections 323, 324, 341, 148, 149 and 506 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 registered at Police Station Sadar Patiala, District Patiala and all the subsequent proceedings are hereby quashed qua the petitioners.

May 14, 2026
Manisha

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

- | | | |
|------|---------------------------|--------|
| (i) | Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| (ii) | Whether reportable | Yes/No |