



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

128

CRM-M-36660-2025

Date of decision: July 15th, 2025

Mandeep and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Gagandeep Sanwal, Advocate
for the petitioners.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.

The instant petition has been preferred under Section 528 of the BNSS, 2023, seeking quashing of FIR No.290 dated 24.07.2024 under Sections 34, 386 of the IPC, 1860 registered at Police Station Sonipat City, and all the subsequent proceedings, on the ground that the dispute between the petitioners and respondent No.2 (the complainant) has been amicably resolved through a compromise.

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners submits that the FIR in question (Annexure P-1) arose out of a personal dispute which has since been settled amicably between the parties with the intervention of well-wishers. A copy of the compromise deed is placed on record as Annexure P-2. On the strength of this compromise, the petitioners seek quashing of the FIR and consequential proceedings arising therefrom.

3. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioners and perused the relevant material on record.

4. The law with respect to quashing of FIR/criminal proceedings on the basis of a compromise between the parties has been authoritatively settled by Hon'ble Supreme Court in its various judicial pronouncements.

Particularly, relevant to the present case is the decision in *Criminal Appeal No.349 of 2019 titled as The State of Madhya Pradesh Versus Laxmi Narayan and others*, wherein it has been held that inherent powers under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. can be exercised to quash criminal proceedings even for non-compoundable offences, where parties have settled the dispute; however, such powers are to be exercised sparingly, carefully and with caution.

5. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Laxmi Narayan's case (supra)* laid down guiding principles, reaffirming what was earlier held in *Narinder Singh Versus State of Punjab (2014) 6 SCC 466*. It was held that offences which are predominantly civil or personal in nature, such as disputes arising out of matrimonial discord, financial transactions, or property disputes, may be quashed upon compromise to secure the ends of justice or prevent abuse of process. The relevant observations of Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Laxmi Narayan's case (supra)* are as follows:

“9.3 In the case of Narinder Singh vs. State of Punjab (2014) 6 SCC 466, after considering the decision in the case of Gian Singh (supra), in paragraph 29, this Court summed up as under:

29. In view of the aforesaid discussion, we sum up and lay down the following principles by which the High Court would be guided in giving adequate treatment to the settlement between the parties and exercising its power under Section 482 of the Code while accepting the settlement and quashing the proceedings or refusing to accept the settlement with direction to continue with the criminal proceedings:

29.1. Power conferred under Section 482 of the Code is to be distinguished from the power which lies in the Court to compound the offences under Section 320 of the Code. No doubt, under Section 482 of the Code, the High Court has inherent power to quash the criminal

proceedings even in those cases which are not compoundable, where the parties have settled the matter between themselves. However, this power is to be exercised sparingly and with caution.

29.2. When the parties have reached the settlement and on that basis petition for quashing the criminal proceedings is filed, the guiding factor in such cases would be to secure:

(i) ends of justice, or

(ii) to prevent abuse of the process of any court.

While exercising the power the High Court is to form an opinion on either of the aforesaid two objectives.

29.3. Such a power is not to be exercised in those prosecutions which involve heinous and serious offences. of mental depravity or offences like murder, rape, dacoity, etc. Such offences are not private in nature and have a serious impact on society. Similarly, for the offences alleged to have been committed under special statute like the Prevention of Corruption Act or the offences committed by public servants while working in that capacity are not to be quashed merely on the basis of compromise between the victim and the offender.

29.4. On the other hand, those criminal cases having overwhelmingly and predominantly civil character, particularly those arising out of commercial transactions or arising out of matrimonial relationship or family disputes should be quashed when the parties have resolved their entire disputes among themselves.

29.5. While exercising its powers, the High Court is to examine as to whether the possibility of conviction is remote and bleak and continuation of criminal cases would put the accused to great oppression and prejudice and extreme injustice would be caused to him by not quashing the criminal cases.”

6. Further, in ***P. Dharamraj Versus Shanmugam and others*** **2022 LiveLaw (SC) 749**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court reiterated the principle that the Court must look beyond the individual interests of the parties and examine the societal impact of the alleged crime before deciding whether to quash criminal proceedings on the basis of a

compromise.

7. In the present matter, the allegations against the petitioners are grave and disturbing. It is alleged that the petitioners were involved in a honey trap extortion crime through which a sum of approximately ₹45,750/- was deceitfully extracted from the complainant. The FIR discloses a calculated *modus operandi* involving deliberate entrapment and exploitation of victims for financial gain. It would be relevant to reproduce the FIR in question, which is as under:

“To, SHO, police station city Sonipat, Sir, I request that I am Krishanpal Singh son of Arjun Singh resident of village Badrakha district Baghpat UP, present address B-H, 601 Shri Vardhman Gardenia Sector-10 Sonipat and I was in my vehicle number DL10CP5740 on 17th May 2024. Two women were standing at Bahalgarh Chowk. I was going from Sonipat to Meerut. At Bahalgarh Chowk, those two women signalled me to stop and one woman said that I also want to go to UP, please make me sit. A woman whose age is about 30-35 years sat on the front seat in my car. After sitting in the car, in mutual conversation, she told her name as Preeti Dahiya resident of Sonipat and took my mobile number 9350579151. And then the conversation started and on the pretext of showing me a cheap plot, she called me to Kakroi Road on 2nd June 2024. I took my above mentioned car and went to Kakroi Road to meet Preeti Dahiya. The same woman was sitting with her whom I had met at Bahalgarh Chowk, who told me her name was Pravesh. After talking to both of them, the three of us sat there and had tea. Then Pravesh went to keep the cups and Preeti Dahiya locked the door of the house from inside and forcibly caught hold of me and took off my clothes and made me naked. Preeti also took off her clothes and lay down on the bed with me. After that Pravesh called a woman and two boys. Preeti and Pravesh asked me for two lakh rupees and said that we have made a video of you and if you do not give the money, we will send this video to your family and will defame you in the society. Then he took out 16740 rupees from my shirt pocket and the RC of the car and my driving license and my Aadhar card and demanded more money. I called

Devendra and transferred 25000 rupees to Preeti's account and called my friend Neeraj Jain and deposited 4000 rupees online in Preeti's account. After that a boy named Deepak and Pravesh named poonam said that we both will go in his car and take the remaining money from his house. I said I don't have money at home, I have an ATM. I will take the ATM from home and withdraw the money and give it to you. After that, after reaching my society, I went to get the ATM from home and those three kept sitting in my car. I reached home and called 112 and called the police and I went downstairs to tell them that I have called the police and will get you caught. After saying this, they ran away with my car and left the car at the gate of the society and ran away from there. All of them forcibly extorted Rs 45740/- by showing the fear of nude video, which I came to know after reading the news in the newspaper that a case has been registered against Honey Trap Preeti etc. and when I told my family the whole thing, they said that you should also take legal action against them, which I have submitted today on 23 July 2024 at Police Station City Sonipat. Please take legal action.”

8. What aggravates the seriousness of the matter is that the petitioners are not first time offenders. It has been admitted by the learned counsel for the petitioners that the petitioners have previously been involved in similar offences and a case stands registered against them; this clearly suggests a pattern of criminal behaviour and an organised effort to exploit vulnerable individuals.

9. Such offences, by their very nature, cannot be termed as purely personal or civil disputes. The impact of such crimes extends far beyond the individual complainant—they corrode public confidence, exploit human vulnerability and destabilize societal trust. The element of criminal conspiracy, manipulation and extortion involved in such incidents renders them inherently antisocial and publicly injurious.

10. Though the parties have entered into a compromise, possibly under circumstances not entirely free from pressure or inducement, this Court is duty-bound to ensure that such serious allegations are investigated thoroughly and brought to their logical conclusion through due process of law. The quashing of an FIR at this stage would amount to stifling a genuine prosecution and permitting the perpetuation of an alleged criminal network that undermines the rule of law.

11. In view of the seriousness of the allegations, the alleged repeat involvement of the petitioners in similar offences and the larger public interest implicated in the present case, this Court is not inclined to exercise its inherent jurisdiction to quash the FIR in question on the basis of a compromise.

12. The directions issued by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *P. Dharamraj's case (supra)* are binding and leave no room for ambiguity: offences that shock the conscience of society and threaten its moral fabric cannot be permitted to be resolved privately behind closed doors.

13. Accordingly, the petition stands dismissed.

14. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

July 15th, 2025
Puneet

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : Yes