



CRM-M-4391-2025

-1-

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

256

CRM-M-4391-2025

Date of decision : 02.07.2025

Puneet Bhutani

..... Petitioner

V/S

State of Haryana and Anr.

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI

Present: Ms. Nisha Kanojia, Advocate for
Mr. Shivansh Malik, Advocate for petitioner.

Ms. Nidhi Garg, AAG, Haryana.

Ms. Ojaswini Gagneja, Advocate for
Mr. Aaryan Suri, Advocate respondent No.2.

AMARJOT BHATTI J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioner- Puneet Bhutani has filed instant petition under Section 528 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for quashing of FIR No. 0168 dated 04.05.2021 under Sections 498-A/406/506/323/34 of IPC (during the course of investigation offence under Section 34 IPC was deleted), registered at Police Station Urban Estate, Rohtak (Annexure P-1) and all other proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise (Annexure P-2).

2. As per facts of the case, complainant Ankita Dhall filed written complaint against her husband and other members of in-laws family, alleging that her marriage was performed with Puneet Bhutani on 24.07.2016. Her parents had given dowry beyond their means. After marriage, her husband and other members of in-laws family were unhappy with the dowry articles. Her parents had spent approximately Rs.36 Lacs on her marriage. Even then, she was taunted



for bringing less dowry. There were frequent quarrels in the matrimonial home. She was ill-treated by her mother-in-law and was not allowed to enter the kitchen. The complainant has mentioned various incidents which took place in the matrimonial home. There was demand for Skoda car for keeping her in the matrimonial home. She also came to know that her husband was having relationship with another girl before marriage and was residing with her which caused great mental trauma to the complainant. She faced continuous ill-treatment in the matrimonial home. She tried to save her marriage and also started doing job. She tried to convince her husband for Honda Amaze car but he insisted on his demand for Skoda car. She started residing at Neemrana where she was working. Her husband was also conniving with his family members. Matter also came before the Panchayat consisting of family members from both sides. Her husband and his family members refused to maintain her unless their demand was satisfied. Thereafter, the matter was reported to the police and present FIR has been registered.

3. Petitioner filed this petition for quashing of aforesaid FIR on the basis of compromise. Vide order dated 27.01.2025, petitioner and respondent No.2 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 Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Rohtak dated 05.05.2025. Statement of respondent No.2 has been recorded where she confirmed the compromise with petitioner. She confirmed that this compromise has been effected voluntarily, without any coercion or undue influence and she has no objection regarding quashing of FIR.



Learned counsel representing State filed status report, which is taken on record.

4. Petitioner- Puneet Bhutani also confirmed this fact in his separate statement. Statement of LHC Neelam is also recorded who confirmed that petitioner is not involved or declared as proclaimed offender in any other criminal case.

5. Therefore, from the report of Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Rohtak it is clear that compromise has been effected between the parties without any pressure, coercion or undue influence. 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. Matter has been settled in Rs.15,00,000/- out of which Rs.7,50,000/- were to be paid by petitioner to complainant at the time of recording of first motion statements and balance amount of Rs.7,50,000/- will be paid at the time of recording of second motion statements. Thereafter, they will be able to live independently in peace and harmony. No purpose would be served with the continuation of criminal proceedings.

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.’

**CRM-M-4391-2025****-4-**

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 petitioner is accepted and FIR No. 0168 dated 04.05.2021 under Sections 498-A/406/506/323/34 of IPC (during the course of investigation offence under Section 34 IPC was deleted), registered at Police Station Urban Estate, Rohtak (Annexure P-1) and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom are quashed qua petitioner.

(AMARJOT BHATTI)
JUDGE

02.07.2025.*Sunil Devi*

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