



CRM-M-62299-2024

-1-

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

269

CRM-M-62299-2024

Date of decision : 09.09.2025

Jitender and Ors.

..... Petitioners

V/S

State of Haryana and Ors.

..... Respondents

**CORAM : HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI**

Present: Mr. D.S.Matya, Advocate for petitioners.

Mr. Rakesh Kumar Jangra, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Sudesh Sahi, Advocate for respondents No.2 &amp; 3.

\*\*\*\*

**AMARJOT BHATTI J. (ORAL)**

1. Petitioners – Jitender, Pardeep and Nirmala have filed this petition under Section 528 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for quashing of FIR No.53 dated 10.06.2020, registered under Sections 323, 354, 406, 498-A, 506 and 34 of IPC 1860 at Women Police Station, District Sonapat (Annexure P-1) and all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, qua the petitioners, in light of the compromise effected between the parties dated 09.12.2024 (Annexure P-2).

2. As per facts of the case, complainant/respondent No.2 Anju filed written complaint against her husband Jitender and other members of the in-laws family alleging that her marriage was solemnized with Jitender on 24.02.2014. Her parents had spent about Rs.20 lakhs on marriage. She gave birth to a son on 28.01.2016. Soon after marriage, her husband and members of in-laws family

**CRM-M-62299-2024****-2-**

started raising demand for more dowry. On the birth of son, there was demand for Innova car. Being fed up with their repeated demands, finally she disclosed everything to her father. He along with his brother/Chacha Dharambir tried to convince the accused persons but they did not listen. Her father borrowed Rs.5 lakhs from the relatives and friends and gave it to her mother-in-law in the presence of her husband and other members of in-laws family. There was another demand of Rs. 5 lakhs but her father expressed his inability to give this amount. Thereafter, the accused persons started harassing her for one reason or the other. She has narrated various incidents which took place in the matrimonial home during her stay with her husband and members of in-laws family. She has levelled allegations against her father-in-law for molesting her and when she disclosed this fact to her husband, he gave her beating. The complainant has narrated one incident of 09.04.2020 when she was beaten up and she informed her parents about the occurrence. When they came to pick her up, they were also attacked. She was taken to the hospital and the matter was reported to the police.

3. Petitioners have arrayed Mahender Singh (father of respondent No.2) as one of the respondents. However, FIR is lodged on the statement of Anju respondent No.2. He is arrayed only being father of Anju and he has given his affidavit accepting the compromise arrived at between the parties (Annexure P-3).

4. Petitioners filed this petition for quashing of aforesaid FIR on the basis of compromise. Vide order dated 11.12.2024, petitioners and respondents No.2 & 3 were directed to appear before the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate for recording their statements on the basis of compromise. Detailed report regarding



**CRM-M-62299-2024**

**-3-**

compromise has been received from the court of Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Sonapat dated 11.02.2025. Statement of respondent No.2 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.

5. Petitioners- Jitender, Pardeep and Nirmala also confirmed this fact in their joint statement. Statement of L/HC Poonam is also recorded who confirmed that petitioners are not declared as proclaimed offenders in any other criminal case. She further stated that petitioners are also involved in FIR No.85/2020, under Section 323, 427, 506, 34 of IPC, Police Station Safidon.

6. Therefore, from the report of Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Sonapat 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 have mutually settled all their claims arisen from matrimonial dispute. They have decided to part ways by filing joint petition under Section 13-B of Hindu Marriage Act. Thereafter, they will be able to live independently in peace and harmony. It will end the litigation started between them. Other FIR registered against petitioners will be decided on its own merits. Present case has arisen on account of matrimonial dispute.

7. 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 titled 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.

**CRM-M-62299-2024****-4-**

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.’

8. 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 and FIR No.53 dated 10.06.2020, registered under Sections 323, 354, 406, 498-A, 506 and 34 of IPC 1860 at Women Police Station, District Sonipat (Annexure P-1) and all subsequent proceedings arisen therefrom are quashed qua petitioners.

**(AMARJOT BHATTI)**  
**JUDGE**

**09.09.2025.***Sunil Devi*

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