

CRM-M-72796-2025

2026:PHHC:026820



330

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-72796-2025

Seema Rani and others

....Petitioners

versus

State of Punjab and another

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present:- Mr. Sandeep Sharma, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Baljinder Singh Sra, Additional AG Punjab.

Mr. Manoj R. Sharma, Advocate for respondent No.2.

SUMEET GOEL, J. (ORAL)

The present petition has been filed under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') seeking quashing of FIR No.21 dated 03.03.2023 (Annexure P-1), under Sections 406, 420 & 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short 'IPC'), registered at Police Station Goraya, District Jalandhar Rural and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 07.09.2024 (Annexure P-2) and notarized on 22.04.2025, which is stated to have been effected between the parties.

2. On 15.01.2026, the following order was passed:

“The petitioners have approached this Court seeking quashing of FIR (Annexure P-1) and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom on the basis of a compromise having been effected between the parties. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that all concerned are parties to the present petition in terms of the dicta of the Division Bench judgment of this Court passed in ‘Rakesh Das Vs. State of Haryana and another’, Neutral Citation: 2024:PHHC;147654-DB. Notice of motion.

At this stage, Mr. Adhiraj Singh, AAG, Punjab has put in appearance on behalf of respondent No.1-State of Punjab and accepts notice.

Mr. Manoj R. Sharma, Advocate has entered appearance on behalf of respondent No.2 and filed his power of attorney.

The parties are directed to get their statements recorded qua the factum of compromise in the following manner:

(i) The parties shall appear before the trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate concerned on 27.01.2026 or any date thereafter as fixed by trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate for recording statements of the petitioner as well as of the complainant qua the factum of compromise. As and when any such appearance is made, the trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate shall do the needful for recording the statements of the parties qua the factum of the compromise. It shall be open to the trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate to either record the statements of the parties by physical process or by video conferencing as deemed appropriate by the trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate.

(ii) In case the statement is to be recorded by way of video conferencing, the parties concerned shall be duly identified through video conferencing by their respective counsel, subject to the satisfaction of the Presiding Officer.

(iii) The trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate may also choose to get the statements of the parties recorded through some Commissioner, appointed by the Court who would be some Advocate having sufficient standing at the Bar. In case the statement is recorded through some Commissioner, such Commissioner/Advocate shall furnish an affidavit after recording statements to the effect that the parties had appeared before him/her and he/she had recorded their statements as per law and that the said parties had been duly identified by their respective counsel. This shall be subject to satisfaction of trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate.

After recording the statements of all the affected parties in either of the aforesaid manner, the trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate shall submit its report on the basis of the statements so recorded as to whether all the affected parties have entered into a compromise and as to whether the compromise in question is found to be a valid compromise and has been effected without there being any kind of influence or coercion.

The trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate shall also report as regards the following facts after seeking information from Investigating Officer, concerned:

(i) Whether there is any other accused other than the petitioner, arrayed in this petition?

(ii) Whether there is any other complainant or affected/ aggrieved party other than the respondents, arrayed in the petition?

(iii) Whether any accused has been declared Proclaimed Offender?

The report be submitted before this Court before the next date of hearing i.e. 19.02.2026.

The petitioner is directed to deposit a sum of ₹50,000/- as costs with the Punjab & Haryana High Court Employees Welfare Association, Bank details whereof reads thus:

Account No.37167209613;

IFSC Code: SBIN0050306;

Branch Code: 50306;

Bank: State Bank of India, High Court Branch, Chandigarh

Payment of costs and production of receipt thereof shall be a condition precedent for recording of statements in the manner directed for hereinabove.

It is explicit that depositing of costs shall not create any kind of equity in favour of the petitioner(s)."

3. Pursuant to the aforesaid order, report dated 11.02.2026 from the learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Phillaur was received. As per the report, the said Court has recorded as follows:

"As such on the basis of the statement of the parties recorded before the undersigned as well as that of the Investigating Officer, the following report is hereby submitted:-

(1) As per the statement of ASI Bawa Singh, No.216, P.S.Goraya, there are only three persons namely Kamaljit Singh @ Rinku, Seema Rani daughter of Inderjit Singh and Gagandeep Kaur wife of Baldeep Singh are arrayed as accused in the present case. All the three accused have appeared in the Court for recording their statements regarding compromise. Apart from the said accused who have filed the present petition there is no other accused.

(2) As per the statement of ASI Bawa Singh, No.216, P.S.Goraya, there is only one complainant or affected/aggrieved person in the present case, except for him there is no other complainant or aggrieved party.

(3) As per the statement of ASI Bawa Singh, No.216, P.S.Goraya, none of the accused has been declared as a Proclaimed Offender in the present case.

From the statement of the parties recorded before the undersigned which were duly identified by their respective counsels it appears that the compromise effected between the parties is genuine, voluntary out of their free will and without any coercion or undue influence."

4. Learned counsel for respondent No.2 admits the fact of parties having compromised, and states that he has no objection in case the FIR and all proceedings subsequent thereto against the petitioners are quashed.

5. Similarly, learned State counsel has stated no objection in case the FIR is quashed based upon the compromise (Annexure P-2).

6. I have heard learned Counsel for the parties and have carefully gone through the records of the case.

7. This Court and the Hon'ble Apex Court has repeatedly dealt with the issue of exercise of jurisdiction under Section 482 of the Code to quash proceeding in non-compoundable offences in the cases of *Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab and another*, 2012(10) SCC 303, *Kulwinder Singh & others vs. State of Punjab & another*, 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052 and *Ram Gopal and another vs. State of Madhya Pradesh*, 2021(4) R.C.R. (Criminal) 322 (Criminal Appeal No.1489 of 2012 decided on 29th of September, 2021). The proposition of law that emerges from the aforesaid decisions rendered by the Hon'ble Apex Court and this Court is:

- (a) *Power u/s 482 Cr.P.C. vested with this Court is much wider and is unaffected by Section 320 of the Code.*
- (b) *However, wider the power greater the caution.*
- (c) *The underlining principle while exercising such power is that it can be invoked to quash the proceedings recognizing compromise between the parties in the matters which are overwhelmingly and predominantly of civil character like commercial transactions or arising out of matrimonial relationship or family disputes.*
- (d) *The said power is not to be exercised in the prosecutions involving heinous and serious offences of mental depravity or offences like murder, rape, dacoity etc. as such offences are not private in nature and have a serious impact on society.*
- (e) *Section 482 Cr.P.C. casts duty upon the High Court to advance interest of justice as well. It is in recognition of this duty casted upon the High Court, that Apex Court held that the High Court would not refuse to quash FIR under Section 307 merely because FIR finds mention thereof. High Court can assess nature of injuries sustained, whether such injuries inflicted on vital/delicate parts of the body/nature of weapons used etc.*
- (f) *Such exercise at the hands of High Court would be permissible only after the evidence is collected after investigation and charge-sheet is filed/charges framed during the trial. Such exercise cannot be carried out while the matter is still under investigation.*
- (g) *While quashing FIR in non-compoundable offences even which are of private in nature, High Court is required to consider antecedents of the accused, conduct of the accused and whether he was absconding or whether he has managed the complainant to enter into a compromise.*

The statutory provision of Section 528 of BNSS, 2023 is same as the statutory provision of Section 482 of Cr. P.C. Therefore, the above said

principles of law would apply to a petition under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023 as well.

8. Thus, keeping in view the aforesaid facts and circumstances, this Court is of the considered opinion that it is a fit case to exercise jurisdiction vested u/s 528 of BNSS, 2023 to quash the FIR as:

- (i) *Putting a quietus to the proceedings will bring peace and tranquility amongst parties & will accordingly further the cause of substantial justice;*
- (ii) *The offences alleged are primarily of private nature;*
- (iii) *The parties have compromised;*
- (iv) *As per the report received the compromise is said to be voluntary in its nature;*
- (v) *Complainant/victim is reported to have entered into compromise on his own volition.*

9. Consequently, the petition is **allowed**. FIR No.21 dated 03.03.2023 (Annexure P-1), under Sections 406, 420 & 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short ‘IPC’), registered at Police Station Goraya, District Jalandhar Rural and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise dated 07.09.2024 (Annexure P-2) and notarized on 22.04.2025, are, hereby, quashed *qua* the petitioners.

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

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

February 19, 2026

mahavir

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No