



239 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-51070-2024  
Reserved on: 19.08.2025  
Pronounced on: 22.08.2025

Vaninderpal Singh @  
Vaninderpal Singh Sohi

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

....Respondents

**CORAM : HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL**

Present: Mr. Angad Parmar, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Hardeep Singh Wadhwa, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Vivek K. Thakur, Advocate  
Ms. Kashish Thakur, Advocate  
for respondent No.2.

\*\*\*\*

**SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL, J.**

In this petition under Section 528, Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (B.N.S.S.) 2023, the prayer is for quashing FIR No.11 dated 20.02.2024, under Sections 376, 420 and 506 of Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered in Police Station Rawalpindi, District Kapurthala, Punjab and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise dated 20.08.2024 effected between the parties.

2. On 16.10.2024, this Court directed the parties to appear before the trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate for recording of their statements regarding compromise dated 20.08.2024 on 25.11.2024 or any other date convenient to the Court.

3. In compliance of the aforesaid order, parties appeared before learned Additional District & Sessions Judge, Kapurthala on 18.11.2024



Statement of SI Gursharan Singh was also recorded. Learned Additional District & Sessions Judge, Kapurthala has submitted his report recording satisfaction that all the parties have entered into a valid compromise without any influence or coercion. Point-wise report as under has been submitted:

1. *Yes, a genuine compromise has been arrived at between all the affected parties i.e. accused Vaninderpal Singh @Vaninderpal Singh Sohi and complainant Dilpreet Kaur.*
2. *The complainant Dilpreet Kaur and Lachman Singh father of accused Vaninderpal Singh @ Vaninderpal Singh Sohi on behalf of accused are party to the compromise as accused was in judicial custody at that time.*
3. *No additional accused has been added during investigation.*
4. *No accused is declared Proclaimed Offender.*
5. *After the registration of the FIR, no offence has been added or deleted during investigation.*
6. *No investigation is pending against any of the accused.*

4. Learned State counsel and counsel for respondent No.2 have not raised any dispute regarding the factum of compromise.

5. A few facts may be noticed.

6. Police registered the case on complaint of prosecutrix who alleged that six months ago, she became friendly with Vaninderpal Singh @ Vaninderpal Singh Sohi son of Lachman Singh Sohi, resident of Balala, District Ludhiana on Instagram and Snapchat, whereafter, they started talking and got involved in love affair. They met each other and Vaninderpal Singh @ Vaninderpal Singh Sohi promised to marry her but never spoke to his family. He raised demand of money and gifts etc. and she gave him Rs.4,00,000/- for his expenses. Vaninderpal Singh @ Vaninderpal Singh Sohi emotionally blackmailed her to give money to his friends but in



November his behavior changed. He started making excuses when she asked him to meet her but continued to talk on phone. He called her at Queen Flower resort at Neelon River where he raised demand of Rs.60,000/- on the promise that he would return it. He, once again, convinced her and became intimate. She continued to talk to him but he put off the talks of marriage and always asked for money. On 21.11.2023, she and her family members approached the village Panchayat and father of Vaninderpal Singh @ Vaninderpal Singh Sohi, informed that he had already fixed marriage of Vaninderpal Singh @ Vaninderpal Singh Sohi two months ago. He proclaimed that he would get his son married in Canada and that he had her offensive pictures. Vaninderpal Singh @ Vaninderpal Singh Sohi, Lachhman Singh and Karan Ghuman threatened her. Vaninderpal Singh @ Vaninderpal Singh Sohi's marriage was fixed for 02.02.2024. It was requested that legal action be taken against Vaninderpal Singh @ Vaninderpal Singh Sohi and his friends, Sikandar Gill, Karan Ghuman, Navjot Singh Sohi, who cheated her of money and harassed her mentally and emotionally.

7. Though, the offence under Section 376 of Indian Penal Code is non-compoundable, serious and heinous in nature, this Court is not foreclosed from examining the veracity of allegations which, if proved, would lead to proving the charge for the commission of offence. The Court is also required to consider whether the settlement between the parties will result in peace and harmony between them.

8. Reverting to the facts of the case, petitioner is 32 years old, whereas, age of respondent No.2, at the time when the case was registered, was around 34 years. Both had attained the age of discretion. The case is at



initial stage as challan has been presented in the Court only on 04.04.2024. At the time of alleged occurrence, both petitioner and respondent No.2 were mature adults. Respondent No.2 at the relevant time was mature enough to understand the consequences of the act she was consenting to. From the facts narrated by the prosecutrix, it cannot be discerned that the promise made by petitioner to marry respondent No.2 at the very inception of relationship was false and on the basis of the same, she was induced into sexual intimacy. It can readily be inferred from the narrative that the relationship between the two was purely consensual.

9. In the case of '***Pramod Suryabhan Pawar Vs. State of Maharashtra and another***', AIR 2019 SC 4010, Hon'ble Supreme Court observed as under:-

*"12 This Court has repeatedly held that consent with respect to Section 375 of the IPC involves an active understanding of the circumstances, actions and consequences of the proposed act. An individual who makes a reasoned choice to act after evaluating various alternative actions (or inaction) as well as the various possible consequences flowing from such action or inaction, consents to such action."*

Thus a relationship based on consenting terms cannot be made foundation of a charge as serious as one under Section 376 IPC.

10. In '***Madhukar and others vs. The State of Maharashtra and another***', 2025 LiveLaw (SC)710, Hon'ble Supreme Court of India recognizing that offence under 376 of the Indian Penal Code is of a grave and heinous nature, observed that the power of Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C. to secure the ends of justice is not constrained by a rigid formula and must be exercised with reference to the facts of each case. In that case, the complainant expressed desire not to pursue the case on the ground that she was now married, settled in personal life and continuing with the criminal



proceedings would only disturb her peace and stability. Hon'ble Supreme Court observed that the parties had amicably resolved their differences and arrived at mutual understanding and continuation of trial would not serve any meaningful purpose, rather would only prolong distress for all concerned specially the complainant and burden the Court without the likelihood of productive outcome.

11. The case before us is on identical footing. In her statement before learned Additional District & Sessions Judge, Kapurthala, respondent No.2 has affirmed that she entered into compromise without any pressure or coercion or undue influence and had no objection if the proceedings of the FIR were quashed. She also placed on record copy of compromise Ex.CA. Ex. CA reflects that during investigation of the criminal case, petitioner Vaninderpal Singh @Vaninderpal Singh Sohi had performed marriage. Respondent No.2-Dilpreet Kaur had also decided to settle in life and had decided to resolve all their disputes for betterment of their future.

12. Following the principles of law laid down by a Full Bench Judgment of this Court in ***“Kulwinder Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and another” 2007(3) RCR (Criminal) 1052*** and Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***“Gian Singh Versus State of Punjab and others” (2012) 10 SCC 303***, it is a fit case warranting exercise of discretion under Section 482 Cr.P.C. The parties have resolved their dispute amicably and should be saved from the agony of criminal trial, which would be an exercise in futility, given the nature of allegations against the petitioner and the settlement between the parties. Continuation of criminal proceedings will only add to the sufferings of the parties.

13. The petition is allowed. FIR No.11 dated 20.02.2024, under



Sections 376, 420 and 506 of Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered in Police Station Rawalpindi, District Kapurthala, Punjab along with all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, is quashed qua the petitioner.

**(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)**  
**JUDGE**

**22.08.2025**

neeraj

Whether Speaking/Reasoned : Yes/No

Whether Reportable : Yes/No