



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

301

**CRM-M-58698-2024
Date of decision: 09.09.2025**

RAMAVTAR

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present : Mr. Rahul Singla, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Pawan Kumar Jhanda, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Virender Soni, Advocate for respondent No.2.

SANJAY VASHISTH. J.(Oral)

1. Through the instant petition, prayer is made for quashing of FIR No.618 dated 10.10.2024, under Sections 115, 117(3), 127(2), 351(3) of BNS, 2023, now Sections 115(2) & 308(2) BNS added later on in the array of Sections and Section 3(2)(va) of the Schedule Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, registered at Police Station City Rohtak, District Rohtak and all consequential proceedings enumerating therefrom, on the basis of compromise (Annexure P-2).

2. In compliance with the directions passed by this Court vide order dated 05.04.2025, counsel for the petitioner produces a copy of the order dated 11.02.2025, passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Rohtak, whereby interim bail granted to the petitioner vide order dated 18.12.2024 was confirmed by the said Court. Copy of the said order is taken on record. Registry is directed



- 2-

to tag the same at an appropriate place.

3. Vide order dated 26.11.2024, the affected parties were directed to appear before the learned Trial Court/Illaq Magistrate, for getting their respective statements recorded with regard to the compromise.

4. Report has since been received from learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Rohtak in pursuance to the directions of this Court wherein, the factum of the compromise arrived at between the parties stands verified and confirmed. As per the report(s) compromise has indeed been effected between the parties and the same is without any pressure or coercion and out of their free will and the private respondents have also made statement to the effect that they would have no objection if the FIR qua the accused-petitioners is quashed.

5. The trial Court has annexed the statements of the parties in original, along with its report. The relevant part of the said report is reproduced herebelow:

“As per the statement of Investigating Officer namely Sh. Ravi Khundia, HPS, DSP (HQ), Rohtak, police investigation is still pending in FIR No. 618 dated 10.10.2024, under Sections 115, 115(2), 117(3), 127(2), 308(2), 351(3) of BNS & Section 3(2)(va) of SC & ST Act, Police Station City, Rohtak. In the present case, there is only one accused namely Ram Avtar and one complainant namely Shiva S/o Som Nath and both are present before the Court. Till date, accused has not been joined into police investigation. It is further submitted that neither the accused has been declared P.O. nor P.O. proceedings are pending against him. Except complainant Shiva, there is no other victim in the present case.

The compromise effected between the parties seems to be genuine, voluntarily and without any coercion or undue influence. Till date the police challan has not been presented before the Court as police investigation has not been completed yet.

Accordingly, the report stands submitted. The statement of parties, statement of Investigating Officer in original and copy of zimni order dated



- 3-

09.12.2024 are annexed herewith for your kind information and necessary action.”

6. Learned State counsel submits that petitioner is the only named accused in the FIR in question, and that the private respondents are complainant/aggrieved parties therein.

7. In view of the report of the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Rohtak, and the principles laid down by Hon'ble the Apex Court in ***Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab and others (2012) 10 SCC 303***, and also by the Full Bench of this Court in ***Kulwinder Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and another, 2007(3) RCR (Criminal) 1052***, the instant petition is allowed. The aforesaid FIR and all consequential proceedings arising out of it, are quashed.

8. Needless to say the parties shall remain bound by the terms of compromise and their statements recorded before the Court below

9. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

09.09.2025
amandeep

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