



CRM-M-25347-2025

-1-

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

277

CRM-M-25347-2025

Date of decision : 06.08.2025

Anuj Aggarwal and Ors.

..... Petitioners

V/S

State of Haryana and Ors.

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI

Present: Mr. Ramandeep Singh, Advocate for petitioners.

Mr. Ayuwan Singh, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. G.S.Gurna, Advocate for respondent No.4.

AMARJOT BHATTI J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioners – Anuj Aggarwal, Ganga Ram and Veena @ Veena Aggarwal have filed this petition under Section 528 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for quashing of FIR No.0190 dated 03.12.2023, under Sections 323, 34, 354-A, 406, 498-A of IPC (Section 354-A of IPC was deleted and Section 3(2)(va), 33, 89 of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 added later on), registered at Police Station Women West, District Gurugram (Annexure P-1) and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 20.01.2025 (Annexure P-2).

2. As per facts of the case, complainant/respondent No.4 Bhavishaya Aggarwal filed written complaint alleging that her marriage was performed with Anuj Aggarwal on 18.02.2022. Anuj Aggarwal was known to the family. He belongs to *Baniya* family, whereas she belongs to SC/ST caste. Initially, they had no objection to their inter caste marriage. Few days before marriage, parents of Anuj Aggarwal demanded a brand new *Fortuner* car and cash of Rs.45 Lacs along with jewellery and other gifts. Her family conveyed that they were not having the



CRM-M-25347-2025

-2-

capacity to meet their demand. By that time, wedding cards were already distributed. As per their demand, marriage was performed in a farm house and had spent Rs.13 Lacs. The complainant has given detail of gold ornaments, *shagun*, and other articles given at the time of marriage. On the very next day of her marriage, her mother-in-law protested that marriage was not performed as per their status. Her father-in-law was also unhappy with the marriage. She was made to work in the house. She was illtreated time and again. The family of her husband started saying not to have a child so that they can take divorce from her. All her jewellery was retained by her in-laws. She was harassed by naming her caste time and again. Finally, the matter was reported to the police.

3. Petitioners filed this petition for quashing of aforesaid FIR on the basis of compromise. Vide order dated 26.05.2025, petitioners and respondent No.4 were directed to appear before the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate for recording their statements on the basis of compromise. Detailed report regarding compromise has been received from the court of Additional Sessions Judge, Gurugram dated 03.07.2025. Statement of respondent No.4 has been recorded where she confirmed the compromise with petitioners. She confirmed that this compromise has been effected voluntarily, without any coercion or undue influence and she has no objection regarding quashing of FIR.

4. Petitioners- Anuj Aggarwal, Ganga Ram and Veena @ Veena Aggarwal also confirmed this fact in their joint statements. Statement of Head Constable Rekha is also recorded who confirmed that petitioners are not involved or declared as proclaimed offender in any other criminal case.

5. Therefore, from the report of Additional Sessions Judge, Gurugram it is clear that the compromise has been effected between the parties without any pressure, coercion or undue influence, which is acceptable to both the parties. They



CRM-M-25347-2025

-3-

have mutually settled all their claims arisen from matrimonial dispute. They have filed joint petition under Section 13-B of Hindu Marriage Act. Matter has been settled in Rs.26,00,000/-. Thereafter, they will be able to live independently in peace and harmony. It will end the litigation started between them.

6. Gainful reference can be made to the judgment of Larger Bench of Five Judges of this High Court cited in **2007(3) R.C.R. (Criminal) 1052 tilted as Kulwinder Singh and Ors. Vs. State of Punjab and Anr.**, where it was explained that ‘there can never be any hard and fast category which can be prescribed to enable the court to exercise its power under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. The only principle that can be laid down is the one which has been incorporated in the section itself i.e. to prevent abuse of the process of any court or to secure the ends of justice.’

7. Therefore, by relying upon the ratio of the aforesaid judgment, no purpose would be served with the continuation of criminal proceedings. Considering these facts, the petition filed by the petitioners is accepted FIR No.0190 dated 03.12.2023, under Sections 323, 34, 354-A, 406, 498-A of IPC (Section 354-A of IPC was deleted and Section 3(2)(va), 33, 89 of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 added later on), registered at Police Station Women West, District Gurugram and all the subsequent proceedings arising out of the same are quashed qua petitioners.

(AMARJOT BHATTI)
JUDGE

06.08.2025.

Sunil Devi

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No