

300+301

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

2026.PHHC.005050



Date of decision: 15.01.2026.

(1)

CRM-M-59312-2025 (O&M)

BALLOR SINGH AND OTHERS

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

THE STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

...Respondent(s)

(2)

2026.PHHC.005051



CRM-M-60898-2025 (O&M)

SUKHWINDER SINGH AND OTHERS

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

THE STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

...Respondent(s)

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

Present :- Mr. Simranjit Singh, Advocate, for
Mr. L.S. Lakhanpal, Advocate,
for the petitioners in CRM-M-59312-2025 and
for the respondents 2 to 6 in CRM-M-60898-2025

Mr. Rituraj Singh, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Kulwinder Singh, Advocate,
for respondents No.2 and 3 in CRM-M-59312-2025 and
for the petitioners in CRM-M-60898-2025

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

Both the petitions are being decided by this common order, as they arise out of the version and cross-version in the same FIR and from the corresponding General Diary entry. For the sake of convenience and brevity, the facts are being adverted to from CRM-M-59312-2025.

2 Prayer in the present petition under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 is for quashing of FIR bearing No.0099 dated 25.08.2025 under Section(s) 115(2), 117(2) and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, registered at Police Station Hariana, District Hoshiarpur, along with all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 10.10.2025 (Annexure P-2).

3 Briefly summarised, aforesaid FIR was registered on the statement of Gurbax Singh son of Sh. Surinder Singh, which is reproduced as under: -

“I am resident of above noted address and work at IDFC Bank, Hoshiarpur. On 2.7.2025 the time will be 8:30 AM, government work was going on in the street and labour was pouring soil. Ballor Singh son of Sh.Surjit singh, resident of Village Fatehpur stopped the labourer. My mother asked Ballor Singgh why he stopped him. There some altercation took place

between my mother Manjit Kaur wife of Surinder Singh and Ballor singh. I came out of the house and saw Ballor Singh, who is my neighbourer. I asked Ballor singh why you had quarreled with my mother. Ballor Singh quarreled with me and behind him, his son Ranjodh singh came with spade and on hearing our noise, my uncle Sukhwinder Singh son of Niranjan Singh also came there. Ballor Singh hit me with the stick which he held in his hand, which hit on my nose and meanwhile, their daughter namely Tajinder Kaur daughter of Ballor Singh came there alongwith Danda and she hit me with Danda, which hit on my right arm. My uncle Sukhwinder Singh came forward in order to save me then Ranjodh Singh gave blow from the reverse side of spade carrying in his hand, again hit spade, which hit on the left side of my head and he fell down. Then adjoining peoples gathered there and then the assailants went to their house alongwith their respective weapons and then I was got admitted in hospital by Sukhvir Singh Saini, where I am under treatment. The cause of grudge is that on stopping them from putting soil on the road, they gave beating to us. Ballor Singh, Ranjodh singh and Tajinder Kaur gave beatings to me and my uncle Sukhwinder Singh. Appropriate legal action be taken against them.”

4 The cross-version leading to entering of the G.D. No.36 dated 04.07.2025 on the statement of Ranjodh Singh son of Ballor Singh reads thus:

-

“Statement of Ranjodh Singh son of Sh. Ballor Singh, resident of Village Fatehpur, Police Station, Haryana, District Hoshiarpur, aged about 23 years. Stated that I am resident of above noted address do agriculture work. On 2.7.2025 the time will be 8:30 PM, I was standing outside my house in Gali and Gurbaksh Singh and his mother were standing in the Gali and talking to my uncle Bhupinder Singh and uncle Bhupinder singh called me and I went there and uncle Bhupinder singh asked me

why your father Ballor Singh stopped pouring soil, so I said that my father did not stop the labour from working, then we started having a light, then Sukhwinder Singh son of Niranjan Singh came in the street and said that caught him and drag him inside and started abusing and caught me from my neck and Gurbaksh Singh took kirpan from inside and gave blow to my grand-father Surjit Singh, who stopped the kirpan blow with his spade and meantime Sukhi also came there, who is brother of Sukhwinder Singh, he also caught me and also grabbed my hair and meanwhile my father Ballor singh also came there. Then Gurbaksh Singh gave blunt kirpan blow to my father, which hit on arm and leg then Sukhwinder and Sukhi grabbed me and gave beating to me and Sukhi grabbed me by the leg and dragged me inside, which caused friction on my elbows and knees, then my mother and my sister Tajinder Kaur also came there. Gurbaksh Singh pushed them and my sister also suffered injuries. Gurbaksh Singh abused my sister. The silver chain which was around my neck fell somewhere during the fight. My uncle Bhupinder Singh rescued me from them. The above said assailants went to their houses by abusing and threatening me. Then my grand-father Surjit singh son of Amar Singh got me and my father Ballor Singh to Civil hospital, Bhunga, where I am under treatment. Appropriate legal action be taken against them. Statement heard, which is true. Action be taken. Sd/- Ranjodh Singh.”

5 The parties were directed to appear before the learned trial Court/Illaq Magistrate vide order dated 27.10.2025 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. A similar direction was given vide order dated 03.11.2025 in CRM-M-60898-2025.

6 Pursuant to the said order, report has been received from the

Judicial Magistrate First Class, Hoshiarpur, vide Memo No.924 dated 24.12.2025. The relevant extract of the report is reproduced as under:-

“In view of the statements suffered by the parties, the point wise report is being submitted as follows:-

1. There three accused namely Ballor Singh, Ranjodh Singh and Tajinder Kaur involved in the dispute/FIR.

2. There are two complainant/victim(s) in the present case.

3. All the accused and complainant/victim(s) are party to the compromise and signed the same.

4. All the affected persons are party in the quashing petition.

5. As per statement of IO no accused is declared as proclaimed offender/person or any such proceedings against them have been initiated or pending adjudication.

6. As per the statements of the parties the compromise appears to be genuine, voluntary and without any coercion or undue influence.”

7 A similar report has also been received in the second case as well. The same is not being disputed and being similar, needs no reproduction.

8 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.

9 Learned counsel for respondents reiterates the settlement and his concurrence to the FIR and all the other consequential proceedings being quashed.

10 The broad principles for exercising the powers under Section 482, Cr.P.C (now Section 528 BNSS) 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.”

11 The Hon'ble Supreme Court has held in the matter of '**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.

12 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 BNSS:-

(i)The allegations in the FIR disclose a sudden neighbourhood altercation arising out of a trivial dispute relating to government work being carried out in the street, without any premeditation or prior concert to commit an offence.

(ii)Petitioner No.1 is aged about 46 years, while petitioner Nos.2 and 3 are in their early twenties. Continuation of the criminal proceedings would have a serious and disproportionate impact

discharge of their social and professional obligations and would adversely affect petitioner Nos.2 and 3 in the pursuit of their education, studies and future career prospects.

(iii) The incident appears to have occurred in the heat of the moment, following a verbal exchange between neighbours, and thereafter escalated into a scuffle involving family members from both sides, thereby indicating a mutual quarrel rather than a one-sided criminal act.

(iv) The dispute is purely personal, localised and familial in nature, arising out of inter se misunderstandings between closely situated residents and does not involve any element of public disorder or societal impact warranting continuation of criminal proceedings;

(v) Significantly, the parties have amicably resolved their differences and entered into a compromise with the intervention of respectable members of the society;

(vi) In view of the compromise so arrived at, the likelihood of the complainant or other injured persons supporting the prosecution case is remote and the probability of securing a conviction is also bleak;

(vii) The FIR in question pertains to the year 2025 and the criminal proceedings are still at a nascent stage, with no substantive progress having been made thus far;

(viii) The continuation of criminal proceedings in the face of an amicable settlement would serve no larger public interest and

would only result in unnecessary harassment of the parties and futile consumption of valuable judicial time;

(ix) The offences alleged cannot be characterised as heinous or of such gravity as to shock the conscience of society at large or of this Court, particularly in light of the fact that the injuries appear to have been sustained during a sudden scuffle.

(x) In the totality of the circumstances, the continuation of the DDR and all proceedings emanating therefrom would amount to an abuse of the process of law and the ends of justice would be better served by quashing the same in view of the compromise arrived at between the parties.

13 In view of the report of the Judicial Magistrate First Class, Hoshiarpur 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 bearing No.0099 dated 25.08.2025 under Section(s) 115(2), 117(2) and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, registered at Police Station Haryana, District Hoshiarpur, and DDR bearing No.036 dated 04.07.2025 under Section(s) 115(2) and 351 (2) of the BNS, 2023 recorded at PS Haryana, District Hoshiarpur along with all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom is hereby quashed on the basis of compromise dated 10.10.2025 (Annexure P-2) entered between the parties.

14 Petition is allowed in above terms.

15 A photocopy of the order be placed on the connected file(s).

January 15, 2026.	(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
raj arora	JUDGE
<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	: <i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	: <i>Yes/No</i>