



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

**283**

**CRM-M-54094-2025  
Date of decision: 22.01.2026**

**KARANBIR SINGH @ KARANVEER SINGH** .....Petitioners

**VERSUS**

**STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER** .....Respondents

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

**\*\*\*\*\***

Present: - Mr. Ankit Kharbanda, Advocate  
for the petitioners.

Mr. Saurav Verma, Addl. A.G. Punjab.

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

**\*\*\*\*\***

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

1. Prayer in the present petition under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 is for quashing of FIR bearing No.197 dated 20.12.2019 registered under Sections 420 and 201 (added later on) of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Cantonment, District Amritsar, along with all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 02.09.2025 (Annexure P-2).

2. The FIR in question came to be registered on the complaint of Sukhjit Singh, alleging that his father, Dilbag Singh, who was employed as a government teacher and was in receipt of pension after retirement, expired on 27.01.2019. It is stated that the pension amount was being credited to his father's account maintained with the Bank of India. The complainant has averred that on or about 01.09.2019, with an intent to usurp the property, cash, jewellery and other movable articles belonging to the family, his sisters, namely Paramjit Kaur and Rashpinderjit Kaur, along with Jatinder Maan (brother-in-law), Karanveer Singh (nephew), acting in connivance with one another, dishonestly withdrew amounts from the pension account bearing No. 30041980431 maintained with the Bank of India, despite having no lawful right or entitlement thereto. It is further stated that the said accused persons also misappropriated household articles and jewellery belonging to the complainant's family. On these allegations, the present FIR has been registered.

3. It is however averred that with the intervention of the respectables from both sides, the matter has now been settled and amicably resolved. It is further submitted that the compromise amongst the parties was effected on account of free will and without any pressure and coercion.

4. Pursuant to the order dated 24.09.2025, cost of Rs. 10,000/- has been deposited by the petitioner and a report in this regard has also been received from the Judicial Magistrate 1<sup>st</sup> Class, Amritsar vide Memo No. 181 dated 07.11.2025. The relevant extract of the report reads thus:-

*“1. That as per the statement of Investigating Officer, only one accused is nominated in the present FIR.*

2. *That as per the statement of Investigating Officer, there is only one complainant Sukhjit Singh in this case.*

3. *That as per record, Complainant Sukhjit Singh and accused Karanbir Singh are party to compromise and they both have signed the same.*

4. *That as per the statement of Investigating Officer and record available, there is no affected person left or not arrayed as party in the quashing petition before Hon'ble High Court.*

5. *That as per the statement of Investigating Officer, no person has been declared as Proclaimed Person nor any such proceedings against the accused has been initiated or pending, as per record available with him.*

6. *That as per the statements of complainant and accused person recorded before the undersigned, the compromise has been effected between both the parties is genuine, voluntarily and without any coercion or undue influence.*

7. *That as per the statement of Investigating Officer, as per record, there is no other criminal case against the accused.”*

5. 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.

6. Mr. Amandeep Singh, Advocate appears on behalf of respondent No. 2 and reiterate the settlement and their concurrence to the quashing of the FIR alongwith all the other consequential proceedings.

7. The broad principles governing the exercise of powers under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure 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’** wherein it was held as under:

*16. The broad principles which emerge from the precedents on the subject, may be summarised in the following propositions:*

*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.*

8. 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.

9. On consideration of the above, the following relevant factors emerge for supplementing a case for invocation of the powers under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023:-

- a. It is established from the report of Judicial Magistrate First Class, Amritsar that a compromise has been effected voluntarily between the parties and the same is genuine and without any coercion or any undue pressure.
- b. That the petitioner is aged 24 years and continuation of criminal proceedings is likely to have a serious and disproportionate impact on his career and future prospects and in the discharge of his social and professional obligations.
- c. The dispute emanates from intra-family disagreements concerning withdrawal of pension amounts and division of

household articles and jewellery and is essentially private and civil in character.

- d. The allegations do not disclose offences of a heinous nature nor do they involve any element that would shock the collective conscience of society or adversely affect public interest.
- e. In view of the settlement, the complainant has no subsisting grievance against the accused person, thereby eroding the very foundation of the prosecution case.
- f. The likelihood of the complainant supporting the prosecution in the face of the compromise is remote and continuation of the criminal proceedings would thus be an exercise in futility with no reasonable prospect of conviction.
- g. Permitting the criminal proceedings to continue despite the amicable settlement would serve no larger public purpose and would only perpetuate family discord and result in unnecessary harassment of the parties.
- h. Quashing of the FIR in the present facts would advance the ends of justice, restore familial harmony, and prevent abuse of the process of law.

10. In view of the report submitted by the Judicial Magistrate First Class, Amritsar and having regard to the settled principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court on the subject, the instant petition is allowed. The aforesaid FIR bearing No.197 dated 20.12.2019 registered under Sections

420 and 201 (added later on) of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Cantonment, District Amritsar and all other consequential proceedings arising therefrom **are hereby quashed** in view of the compromise dated 02.09.2025 (Annexure P-2).

Petition is allowed.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)  
JUDGE

JANUARY 22, 2026  
*Vishal Sharma*

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No  
Whether Reportable : Yes/No