



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

279

CRM-M-36492-2019 (O&M)
Date of decision: 05.08.2025

MANJIT KAUR

...PETITIONER

V/s

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Rajnish K. Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Gaurav Gurcharan S. Rai, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Puneet Singh, Advocate for respondent No.2.

SUMEET GOEL, J.

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. for quashing of FIR No.0087 dated 28.07.2019 under Sections 289/337 of IPC, registered at Police Station, Mullanpur, District SAS Nagar, Mohali and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 16.08.2019 attested on 19.08.2019 (Annexure P-2/T), which is stated to have been effected between the parties.

2 On 03.07.2025, the following order was passed:

“The petitioner has approached this Court seeking quashing of FIR and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom on the basis of a compromise having been effected between the parties.

Mr. Puneet Singh, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of respondent no.2 by filing vakalatnama, which is taken on record.

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

(i) The petitioners shall appear before the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate concerned on 15.7.2025 or any date thereafter as fixed by trial Court/Illaq Magistrate for recording statements of the petitioners as well as of the complainant qua the factum of compromise. As and when any such appearance is made, the trial Court/Illaq 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/Illaq 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 petitioners, 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. 5.8.2025.”

3. Pursuant to the aforesaid order, report dated 01.08.2025 from Judicial Magistrate, Ist Class, Kharar, SAS Nagar has been received, which is taken on record. As per the report, the Trial Court has recorded as follows:-

“As per the order dated 03.07.2025 passed by Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court, Chandigarh in CRM-M-36492-2019 (O & M) the parties were directed to appear before Ld. Area Magistrate/Trial court for getting their statements recorded with regard to the compromise arrived at between them and the Ld. Illaqa Magistrate/Trial Court was directed to submit its report, after ensuring the fact that whether the compromise effected between the parties is found to be valid compromise and has been effected without there being any kind of influence or coercion.

Both the parties i.e. complainant Amritpal Singh son of Now with the intervention of the respectable persons of the society they have compromised the matter with each other vide compromise deed dated 16.08.2019 attested on 19.8.2019 by the Notary, the copy of the same is already marked as Mark A which bears her signatures as one of the party. The said compromise is effected between them without any undue influence, pressure or coercion. Copy of her Aadhar Card is Mark C.

Statement of Investigating Officer ASI Rakesh Kumar has also been recorded whereby he stated that he is the Investigating Officer of the present FIR No.87 dated 28.07.2019 u/s 289, 337 IPC Police Station Mullanpur Garibdass and the same was got lodged on the statement of the



complainant Amritpal Singh, Son of Didar Singh, resident of Village Takipur, PS Mullanpur, District SAS Nagar against the accused Manjit Kaur wife of Late Harbans Singh. As per the record, there is only one person arrayed as accused namely Manjit Kaur wife of Late Harbans Singh in the present FIR and Amritpal Singh, Son of Didar Singh is the only complainant/injured in the present FIR. As per record, the accused Manjit Kaur wife of Late Harbans Singh has never been declared as proclaimed offender in the present FIR. The undersigned has carefully gone through the statements got recorded by complainant and accused person and it appears from the statements of the parties that the compromise is genuine, voluntary, valid and without any coercion or undue influence. All the affected parties have entered into compromise.

Further from the statement of Investigating Officer ASI Rakesh Kumar, it appears that in the present case only one person is arrayed as accused namely Manjit Kaur wife of Late Harbans Singh. It also appears that there is only one complainant or affected/aggrieved party namely Amritpal Singh. From the statements of the IO it also appears that accused Manjit Kaur has not been declared as Proclaimed Offender. Accordingly, the report is submitted. ”

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

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

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 chargesheet 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.*

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 482 of Cr.P.C. 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.0087 dated 28.07.2019 under Sections 289/337 of IPC, registered at Police Station, Mullanpur, District SAS Nagar, Mohali and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 16.08.2019 attested on 19.08.2019 (Annexure P-2/T), are, hereby, quashed qua the petitioner.
10. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

05.08.2025

jatn

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes/No

Whether reportable:

Yes/No