



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

\*\*\*\*

283

CRM-M-17545-2025

Date of Decision : 22.04.2025

ANIMESH

...Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE KIRTI SINGH

Present: Mr. Manjeet Saini, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Brijesh Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Abhishek Chaturvedi, Advocate  
for respondent No.2.

\*\*\*\*

**KIRTI SINGH, J. (ORAL)**

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 528 of BNSS for quashing of FIR No.100, dated 02.03.2024, registered under Sections 376(2)(n), 323, 506 of IPC, registered at Police Station Badhshahpur, District Gurugram and all other consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 07.02.2025 (Annexure P-2) effected between the parties.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner relies upon a judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Kapil Gupta Vs. State of N.C.T. of Delhi and another, 2022 (4) RCR (CrI.) 497, to contend that FIR under Section 376 of IPC can be quashed on the basis of compromise. Learned counsel has further relied upon a judgment of this Court in Karan Sharma Vs. State of Haryana and another, 2021(1) Law Herald 149 and contends that once the parties have compromised the matter and decided to live in peace, no useful purpose will be served in allowing the criminal proceedings to continue.



3. Heard learned counsel for the parties and also gone through the case file.

4. Vide this Court's order dated 01.04.2025, directed the parties to appear before the trial Court/Illaq/Duty Magistrate for recording their statements with regard to the compromise. The said order is reproduced hereinbelow:-

*This petition has been filed for quashing of FIR No.100 dated 02.03.2024 under Sections 376(2)(n), 323 & 506 IPC registered at Police Station Badhshahpur, District Gurugram, Haryana, along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise/affidavit dated 07.02.2025 (Annexure P2) arrived at between the parties.*

*Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case on the allegation of establishing forceful physical relations with respondent No.2. He submits that it is an admitted fact by respondent No.2, a married woman, that she was in a four year long consensual relationship with the petitioner. It is further submitted that there was no instance of coercion during the entire duration of their relationship and that present FIR was lodged when the petitioner told the complainant that he is getting engaged to a girl in January, 2024. It is submitted that now, the matter stands compromised between both the parties, as is evident from the compromise deed dated 07.02.2025 (Annexure P2).*

*Notice of motion.*

*Ms. Mahima Yashpal, DAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1-State and Mr. Abhishek Chaturvedi, Advocate, accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.2 and has filed his vakalatnama. The same is taken on record. He has admitted the factum of compromise effected between the parties.*

*The parties are directed to appear before the trial Court/Illaq/Duty Magistrate on 07.04.2025 or any other future date as per its convenience or on request of the parties for getting their statements recorded with regard to the compromise. The trial*



*Court/Illaq/Duty Magistrate shall submit the report on or before the next date of hearing. The report be forwarded to this Court specifying the following:-*

- 1. The number of accused arraigned in the FIR and how many have appeared before it and have made statements and whether any accused is absconding/proclaimed person, in the case;*
- 2. The name of the complainant and injured/aggrieved and whether all of them have appeared and made their statements in support of the compromise;*
- 3. The stage of the trial/proceedings pending;*
- 4. If, the compromise is genuine, voluntary and out of free will of the parties;*
- 5. Whether any other criminal case pending against the accused.*

*Report of the trial Court/Illaq/Duty Magistrate be awaited for 22.04.2025.”*

5. Pursuant to the aforesaid order, report dated 17.04.2025 has been received from the Additional District and Sessions Judge, Gurugram. A perusal of the said report reveals that statements of the concerned persons have been recorded in the present case, who have stated that the matter has been settled between them and they have no objection in case the FIR in question is quashed. The compromise effected between them is genuine, without any undue influence and coercion.

6. The Full Bench of this Court in ***Kulwinder Singh and others vs. State of Punjab, 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052***, held that High Court has power under Section 482 Cr.P.C. to allow the compounding of non-compoundable offence and quash the prosecution where the High Court is of the view that the same was required to prevent the abuse of the process of law or otherwise to



secure the ends of justice. This power of quashing is not confined to matrimonial disputes alone.

7. Hon'ble the Supreme Court in the case of ***Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab and another, 2012 (4) RCR (Criminal) 543***, had observed that in order to secure the ends of justice or to prevent the abuse of process of Court, inherent power can be used by this Court to quash criminal proceedings in which a compromise has been effected. The relevant portion of para 57 of the said judgment reads thus:-

*“57. The position that emerges from the above discussion can be summarised thus: the power of the High Court in quashing a criminal proceeding or FIR or complaint in exercise of its inherent jurisdiction is distinct and different from the power given to a criminal court for compounding the offences under Section 320 of the Code.*

*Inherent power is of wide plenitude with no statutory limitation but it has to be exercised in accord with the guideline engrafted in such power viz; (i) to secure the ends of justice or (ii) to prevent abuse of the process of any Court.*

xxx

xxx

xxx. ”

8. In view of the afore-referred judgments, perusing the report of the trial Court regarding amicable settlement between the petitioner and the complainant, this Court finds that quashing the FIR will accord a quietus to all disputes between the parties and it is in the interest of both sides to bury the hatchet and lead a peaceful life. Thus, no useful purpose would be served in continuing the proceedings and in order to secure the ends of justice, the criminal proceedings in the present case deserve to be quashed.

9. Resultantly, the present petition is allowed and FIR No.100, dated 02.03.2024, registered under Sections 376(2)(n), 323, 506 of IPC, registered at Police Station Badhshahpur, District Gurugram and all other consequential



proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 07.02.2025 (Annexure P-2) is quashed qua the petitioner ***subject to the costs of Rs. 20,000/- to be deposited in the Poor Patient Welfare Fund, PGIMER, Chandigarh within one month.***

10. Pending application(s), if any, also stands disposed of accordingly.

**(KIRTI SINGH)**  
**JUDGE**

**22.04.2025**

*Nisha Yadav*

|                                  |               |
|----------------------------------|---------------|
| <i>Whether Speaking/reasoned</i> | <i>Yes/No</i> |
| <i>Whether Reportable</i>        | <i>Yes/No</i> |