



CRM-M-1629-2026

1

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

289

**CRM-M-1629-2026
Decided on : 08.04.2026**

Narinder Singh and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Bikramjit Singh, Advocate for
Mr. J.S. Thind, Advocate
for the petitioners

Mr. Jasdeep Singh Gill, Addl. A.G. Punjab

Ms. Tejasvi, Advocate and
Mr. Navdeep K. Bhullar, Advocate
for respondent No. 2/complainant

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (ORAL)

1. Instant petition has been filed under Section 528 of BNSS, seeking quashing of complaint No.33, u/s 3(1) [wrongly mentioned as 3(10) at all places in the petition] of the Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 r/w Sections 323/324/452/506/148/149 IPC, dated 25.07.2017, titled as, “Sarabjit Singh v. Narinder Singh and others”, pending before the Court of learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Amritsar (Annexure P-1), and order dated 10.01.2020, passed by learned JMIC, Amritsar (Annexure P-2), and all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of the compromise-deed dated 11.12.2025 (Annexure P-3), effected between the parties.



2. Vide order dated 15.01.2026, the affected parties were directed to appear before the learned Trial Court/Illaq Magistrate, for getting their respective statements recorded with regard to the compromise.
3. Report dated 17.02.2026 has since been received from learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Amritsar, in pursuance to the directions of this Court wherein, the factum of the compromise arrived at between the parties stands verified and confirmed. As per the report compromise has indeed been effected between the parties and the same is without any pressure or coercion and out of their free will and the private respondents have also made statement to the effect that they would have no objection if the FIR qua the accused-petitioners is quashed.
4. The trial Court has annexed the statements of the parties in original, along with its report. The relevant part of the said report is reproduced herein below:

Sr. No.	Description	
1.	Total number of persons found involved as accused in the dispute/FIR	Five accused (one accused Gurpreet Singh expired on 01.07.2023)
2.	Number of complainant/victim(s)	One
3.	Whether all the accused and complainant / victims are party to compromise & signed the same	Yes
4.	In case, any affected person(accused or complainant) is left out or not arrayed as party in the quashing petition before High Court, detail whereas; Or His/her statement is till to be recorded, in compliance to the direction of this Court, details of such person	No
5.	Whether any accused has been declared as a proclaimed offender/person or any	No



	such proceedings against him/her have been initiated or pending adjudication	
6.	Report of the Court whether compromise is genuine, voluntary, and without any coercion or undue influence	Yes
7.	Any other aspect relevant to the present case.	NA

5. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners are the only named accused in the FIR in question, and that the private respondent is complainant/aggrieved party therein.
6. Learned State counsel does not dispute the aforesaid factual position and affirms the same during the course of arguments.
7. In view of the report of the learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, Amritsar, and the principles laid down by Hon’ble the Apex Court in *Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab and others (2012) 10 SCC 303*, and also by the Full Bench of this Court in *Kulwinder Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and another, 2007(3) RCR (Criminal) 1052*, the instant petition is allowed. The aforesaid FIR and all consequential proceedings arising out of it, are quashed.
8. Needless to say the parties shall remain bound by the terms of compromise and their statements recorded before the Court below
9. Petition stands disposed of.

08.04.2026
reena

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO
Whether Reportable: YES/NO