



CRM-M-29339-2025

-1-

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

282

CRM-M-29339-2025

Date of decision : 09.09.2025

Shubham Sharma and Anr.

..... Petitioners

V/S

State of Haryana and Anr.

..... Respondents

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

Present: Ms. Anukriti Sharma, Advocate for  
Mr. Baldev Singh, Advocate for petitioners.

Mr. Rakesh Kumar Jangra, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Pramod Bhardwaj, Advocate  
for respondent No. 2.

\*\*\*\*

**AMARJOT BHATTI J. (ORAL)**

1. Petitioners Shubham Sharma and Tej Pal Sharma have filed this petition under Section 528 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for quashing of FIR No.50 dated 03.05.2023, registered under Sections 323, 406, 498-A, 506, 34 of IPC 1860 at Police Station Women Jind, District Jind (Annexure P-1) and all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, qua the petitioners, in light of the compromise effected between the parties dated 14.05.2025 (Annexure P-2).

2. As per facts of the case, complainant/respondent No.2 Ms.Lalita Sharma filed written complaint against her husband Shubham Sharma and other members of in-laws family with the allegations of demand for dowry, physical harassment and beatings given to her by her husband and members of in-laws family. Her marriage was performed with Shubham Sharma on 21.11.2021 and her parents had spent around Rs.20 Lakhs on her marriage. All her dowry articles

**CRM-M-29339-2025****-2-**

were entrusted to the members of in-laws family as her *Istridhan*. Her husband was law graduate. Her in-laws family taunted her for not bringing sufficient dowry. She was time and again insulted in the matrimonial home. As per the demand of accused persons her father was sending money from time to time but her harassment continued. The complainant's work visa was approved for U.K. She along with her husband went to U.K. on 19.11.2022. The other members of in-laws family started instigating her husband on phone. Even there, she was harassed and beaten up. Finally, they returned to India on 15.01.2023. The maltreatment on account of their demands continued and finally, she lodged the present complaint.

3. Petitioners filed this petition for quashing of aforesaid FIR on the basis of compromise. Vide order dated 28.05.2025, petitioners 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 Chief Judicial Magistrate, Jind dated 09.07.2025. 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.

4. Petitioners- Shubham Sharma and Tej Pal Sharma also confirmed this fact in their joint statement. Statement of L/HC Suman is also recorded who confirmed that petitioners are not involved or declared as proclaimed offenders in any other criminal case.

5. Therefore, from the report of Chief Judicial Magistrate, Jind it is clear that the compromise has been effected between the parties without any



CRM-M-29339-2025

-3-

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. Matter has been settled in Rs.5,00,000/-. 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 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. 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 and FIR No.50 dated 03.05.2023, registered under Sections 323, 406, 498-A, 506, 34 of IPC 1860 at Police Station Women Jind, District Jind (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