



244

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

CRM-M-63886-2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision:07.04.2026

Jaspreet Singh and Anr.

...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and Others

...Respondents

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present: Mr. Hitesh Verma, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Charanpreet Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Ms. Amarinder Kaur, Advocate
for respondents No.2 and 3.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioners have filed the present petition under Section 528 of B.N.S.S. with a prayer to quash the FIR No.37 dated 24.03.2021, under Sections 377 of IPC, 120-B,506 of IPC and 6 of POCSO Act added later on and Section 4 of POCSO Act deleted, Police Station P.S Tappa Mandi, District Barnala (Annexure P-1) and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners contend that both the petitioners were juveniles at the time of registration of the F.I.R and were falsely involved in the abovementioned F.I.R (Annexure P-1). However, during the course of trial, the parties have entered into a compromise and the continuation of the criminal prosecution would be an abuse of the process of the Court.

3. While issuing notice of motion on 13.11.2025, a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court had noticed the following contentions:-

“Counsel for the petitioners relies upon orders passed by different



Benches of this Court in CRM-M-23458-2016 titled as “Sunil Kumar @ Sunny and another Vs. State of Punjab and others” decided on 05.10.2018, “Sahil and another Vs. State of Haryana and another” reported as 2024(1) RCR (Criminal) 341 and Varinder Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and others reported as 2019(1) AICLR 835 and submits that the dispute in the main case i.e. in FIR No.37 dated 24.03.2021 impugned herein, has been resolved amicably and parties have agreed to get the proceedings quashed.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Saurav Verma, Addl. A.G., Punjab accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1-State and prays for some time to file the reply/status report.

Ms. Amarinder Kaur, Advocate enters appearance on behalf of respondents no.2 and 3 and she does not dispute the fact that the matter has been compromised between the parties.

*The affected parties are directed to appear before the learned Trial Court/Illaq Magistrate, for getting their respective statements recorded with regard to the compromise on or before 15.12.2025 and subject to the petitioner depositing costs of Rs.15,000/- each with “**DHFWS SKS USERFEES CS OFFICE, PKL, Account No. 50100189689492, HDFC0004832, HDFC Bank, Sector-6, Panchkula**”,. Thereupon, the concerned Court shall submit a detailed report, containing the information on the following points, along with copies of the statements to this Court, on or before the adjourned date:*

I. Total number of persons found involved as accused in the dispute/FIR;

II. Number of complainant/victim(s);

III. Whether all the accused and complainant / victims are party to compromise & signed the same;

IV. In case, any affected person (accused or complainant) is left out or not arrayed as party in the quashing petition



before High Court, detail whereof; OR His/her statement is still to be recorded, in compliance to the direction of this Court, details of such person;

V. Whether any accused has been declared as a proclaimed offender/person or any such proceedings against him/her have been initiated or pending adjudication;

VI. Report of the Court whether compromise is genuine, voluntary, and without any coercion or undue influence;

VII. Any other aspect relevant to the present case.

4. Now, in compliance of the order dated 13.11.2025, a report has been submitted by the Court of Sessions Judge, Barnala and as per the report, the complainant and the victim as well as the accused had got their statements recorded before the Court without any pressure or coercion and the compromise deed dated 05.08.2025 had been effected between the parties without any pressure, threat or coercion.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed a status report by way of an affidavit of Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub Division Tappa, District Barnala on behalf of respondent No.1 and the same is taken on record. However, he submits that it is a case of sexual assault and the petitioners were the main accused and the present petition is liable to be quashed by this Court.

6. On the other hand, learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondents No.2 and 3 submits that he has no objection in case, the present petition is allowed by this Court in view of the compromise as well as the statements made by them before the Trial Court.

7. I have considered the rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties and perused the record carefully.



8. No doubt, the offence involved in the present case are serious in nature and normally, the Courts are not inclined to quash the FIRs in such matters. However, another fact, which needs to be kept in mind is that in the present case both the petitioners are juveniles and deserve to be given a chance to reform themselves rather than to force them to face trial. Moreover, it is also apparent from the report received from the Trial Court that the parties have already compromised the matter. Consequently, the continuation of the proceedings would be merely abuse of the process of the Court. Even, the observations of this Court are supported by the law laid down by this Court in ***CRM-M-23458-2016 titled as “Sunil Kumar @ Sunny and another Vs. State of Punjab and others” decided on 05.10.2018, “Sahil and another Vs. State of Haryana and another” reported as 2024(1) RCR (Criminal) 341 and Varinder Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and others reported as 2019(1) AICLR 835.***

9. In view of the above discussion, the present petition is allowed and the FIR No.37 dated 24.03.2021, under Sections 377 of IPC, 120-B,506 of IPC and 6 of POCSO Act added later on and Section 4 of POCSO Act deleted, Police Station P.S Tappa Mandi, District Barnala (Annexure P-1) and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom are quashed by this Court qua the petitioners only.

10. Pending application(s), if any, stand(s), disposed of, accordingly.

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

07.04.2026
hitesh

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