

2025:PHHC:025414



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

**CRM M-15500 of 2024**

**Date of Decision: 21.02.2025**

Karnail Singh and others ...Petitioners  
Versus  
The State of Punjab and others ... Respondents

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE N.S.SHEKHAWAT**

Present : Mr. Vinay Kumar Gupta, Advocate, for the petitioners.  
Mr. Deepinder Singh Brar, Sr. DAG, Punjab.  
Mr. Naresh Chander, Advocate,  
for respondents No. 2 and 3.

**N.S.SHEKHAWAT, J. (Oral)**

1. The present petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. has been filed for quashing of FIR No.80 dated 20.04.2022 (Annexure P-1) under Sections 324/323/148/149 IPC (Section 307 IPC was added later on vide Diary No.24 dated 12.06.2023) registered at Police Station Dharamkot, District Moga and all other consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise dated 02.02.2024 (Annexure P-2), entered into between the parties.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that in order to live peacefully, parties have entered into Compromise on 02.02.2024 (Annexure P-2), according to which, both the parties have agreed not to proceed further with the FIR in question. He contended that an injury which has been "declared dangerous to life" is in fact an

injury which is "endangering life" and therefore would be punishable under Section 326 IPC. Therefore, in the present case if a conviction was to be recorded, in all probability it would be one under Section 326 IPC and not under Section 307 IPC. Learned counsel further contended that it has been so held in *Atma Singh Vs. The State of Punjab 1980 PLR 719*, *Mohinder Singh & Ors. Vs. State of Punjab 2012(4) RCR (Criminal) 214*, *Narender Singh Vs. State of Haryana & Ors. 2020(3) RCR (Criminal) 66*, *Mehmood Akhtar Vs. State of Punjab 2014(16) RCR (Criminal) 43 & Pritam Singh & Anr. Vs. State of Punjab Crl. Appeal No. 1126-SB-1999 Decided on 25.02.2010*.

3. Vide order dated 06.05.2024, while issuing notice of motion, a Co-ordinate Bench of Court had directed the parties to appear before the Illaqa Magistrate/trial Magistrate for getting their statements recorded with respect to the compromise (Annexure P-2).

4. Pursuant to aforesaid order, the parties have appeared before the Judicial Magistrate 1<sup>st</sup> Class, Moga and got their statements recorded. Report dated 04.06.2024 has been received whereby after recording the statements of the parties, the Court below has shown its satisfaction that the compromise is genuine, voluntary and without any coercion or undue influence.

5. I have heard counsel for the parties and gone through the case file.

6. In the light of the satisfaction shown by the Court below and considering the offence for which the accused have been charged are not of serious nature, together with the fact that compromise will go a long way in ironing out the differences for betterment of future life of the parties and also in view of the law laid down in **Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab and another, 2012 (4) RCR (Criminal) 543 and Kulwinder Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab 2007(3) RCR (Criminal) 1052**, the present petition for quashing the FIR is allowed qua the petitioners.

7. Resultantly, FIR No.80 dated 20.04.2022 (Annexure P-1) under Sections 324/323/148/149 IPC (Section 307 IPC was added later on vide Diary No.24 dated 12.06.2023) Police Station Dharamkot, District Moga alongwith all consequential proceedings arising therefrom are hereby quashed qua the petitioners only.

8. All pending applications, if any, are disposed off, accordingly.

21.02.2025  
amit rana

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)  
JUDGE

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