



CRM-M-54983-2025

1

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

230

CRM-M-54983-2025
Date of decision: 06.02.2026

VIPIN KHATANA AND OTHERS **.... PETITIONER(S)**

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS **...RESPONDENT(S)**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present: Mr. G.S. Dhot, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Vipul Sherwal, AAG Haryana.

Mr. Gurvinder Singh Mehra, Advocate for respondent No.2.

(THROUGH VIDEO CONFERENCING)

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J. (Oral)

The prayer in this petition is for quashing of FIR No.0265 dated 27.09.2022 under Sections 147, 149, 307, 427, 506 of the IPC, 1860 (Sections 325, 120-B of IPC added later on) and Sections 25(1-B) (a) of Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Bhondsi, District Gurugram Haryana and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 25.08.2025 (Annexure P-4) arrived at between the parties.

Vide order dated 29.09.2025 this Court had directed the parties to appear before Illaqa Magistrate for getting their statements recorded with regard to the compromise dated 25.08.2025 (Annexure P-4).

The Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court was to submit a report in this aforesaid regard giving certain details as enumerated in the said order.

Pursuant to the order dated 29.09.2025 passed by this Court, the



CRM-M-54983-2025

2

parties have appeared before the learned Additional District and Sessions Judge, Gurugram and as per the report dated 04.11.2025 submitted to this Court, both the parties have got recorded their respective statements in Court.

A perusal of the aforesaid report would show that the parties have effected a genuine compromise without there being any pressure, coercion or undue influence. In view of the compromise there is a remote possibility of the complainant coming forward to support the prosecution case. The powers under Section 482 Cr.PC can be exercised in such like situation in order to prevent unnecessary vagaries of criminal trial to be faced by the parties, when there are remote chances of conviction of the accused. The compromise in question is found to be fully in consonance with the direction issued by the Court in “Kulwinder Singh & Ors. Vs. State of Punjab 2007(3) RCR (Criminal) 1052 and Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab & Anr., 2012(4) RCR (Crl.) 543”.

In addition, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Narinder Singh and Others vs State of Punjab and Another, 2014 (2) RCR (Criminal) 482, and State of Madhya Pradesh vs Laxmi Narayan and Others, 2019(2) RCR (Criminal) 255, have categorized those cases where quashing on the basis of compromise was permitted and those in which, it was not permitted. It was further observed that the Court concerned may look into the medical evidence and examine the same to see as to whether the conviction under Section 307 of the IPC was possible or not.

Thus, mere registration of an FIR under Section 307 did not foreclose the right of the petitioner/accused to effect a compromise and get the

FIR quashed.

In the present case, there is no injury with a firearm. Therefore it is extremely unlikely that a conviction could be recorded under Section 307 IPC.

In view of the aforesaid report of the learned Additional District and Sessions Judge, Gurugram accompanied by statements of both the parties, the FIR No.0265 dated 27.09.2022 under Sections 147, 149, 307, 427, 506 of the IPC, 1860 (Sections 325, 120-B of IPC added later on) and Sections 25(1-B) (a) of Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Bhondsi, District Gurugram Haryana along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom are hereby quashed qua the petitioners.

The petition stands disposed of.

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

06.02.2026
Kusum

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