

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA**

**Cr.MMO No. 1238 of 2025**

**Decided on : 24.12.2025**

Bhuvnesh @ Bonny & Ors.

...Petitioners

Versus

State of H.P. & Anr.

...Respondents

*Coram*

**The Hon'ble Mr. Justice Virender Singh, Judge.**

*Whether approved for reporting?<sup>1</sup>*

For the petitioners : All petitioners in person, with Mr. Divya Raj Singh, Advocate.

For the respondents : Mr. H.S. Rawat, Mr. Mohinder Zharaick, Additional Advocates General, with Ms. Avni Kochhar Mehta, Deputy Advocate General, for respondent No.1-State.

Respondent No. 2 in person, with Mr. Nitish Negi, Advocate.

**Virender Singh, Judge** (Oral)

Petitioners have approached this Court, under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (hereinafter referred to as 'BNSS'), for quashing of FIR No. 09/2021, dated 20.01.2021, (hereinafter referred to as

<sup>1</sup> *Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment? Yes.*

“FIR in question”) registered under Sections 323, 114, 147, 148, 149, 504, 506 of IPC and Sections 181 and 196 of Motor Vehicles Act, with Police Station Indora, District Kangra, H.P., as well as, the proceedings resultant thereto, which are pending in the Court of learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, Indora, District Kangra, H.P. (hereinafter referred to as “the trial Court”), on the basis of the compromise, which is stated to have taken place between the petitioners and respondent No. 2.

2. It is the case of the petitioners that the FIR in question was registered at the instance of respondent No. 2, Prithvi Singh, in which, he had alleged that during the process of counting of votes of the Panchayat election in Panchayat Ghar Indora, initially exchange of hot words occurred between the parties and later on, the fight took place among the parties. Thereafter, respondent No. 2, reported the matter to the police.

3. On the basis of above facts, police registered the FIR in question and criminal machinery swung into motion.

4. As stated above, after completion of the investigation, police has filed the charge sheet, which is pending before the learned trial Court.

5. As per the case of the petitioners, during the pendency of the proceedings, before the learned trial Court, the matter has been settled between the parties. The terms and conditions of the compromise were reduced into writing and the same has been annexed with the petition, as Annexure P-3. On the basis of Annexure P-3, a prayer has been made to allow the petition by quashing the FIR in question.

6. When put to notice, respondent No. 1/State has filed the status report, disclosing therein, the manner, in which the FIR in question has been registered and how the police had conducted the investigation and filed the charge sheet against the petitioners, which is pending before the learned trial Court.

7. Respondent No. 2, who at one point of time, had levelled the allegations against the petitioners, when appeared before this Court today, has made his statement, exonerating the petitioners from the allegations, which

have been levelled against them, affirming that the FIR in question was lodged by him, on account of a trivial matter and now, matter has been compromised between them. The said compromise has been annexed with the petition as Annexure P-3.

8. Respondent No.2 has also deposed that he has no objection, if the petition is allowed, in view of the compromise and the FIR in question is quashed.

9. Similar type of statement has also been made by the petitioners jointly.

10. Heard.

11. In view of the statements of the parties, especially the statement of respondent No. 2, who at one point of time, had lodged the FIR in question, but, when appeared before this Court, has exonerated the petitioners, by stating that the matter has been compromised between them, this Court is fully satisfied with regard to the genuineness of the compromise Annexure P-3.

12. As per the stand taken by the parties i.e. petitioners, as well as, respondent No. 2, the scuffle had

taken place on account of a trivial matter and the matter has now been compromised.

13. The primary purpose of law is to maintain peace and harmony in the society. When, the petitioners and respondent No. 2 have buried all their disputes, by compromising the matter, then, permitting the proceedings to continue, before the learned trial Court, would be nothing, but, abuse of the process of law.

14. Even otherwise, acceptance of the compromise, by this Court, will save the precious judicial time of the learned trial Court, which, the learned trial Court will be in a position to devote for the decision of some other serious matters, pending before it.

15. Considering all these facts, the present petition is allowed and FIR No. 09/2021 dated 20.01.2021, registered under Sections 323, 114, 147, 148, 149, 504, 506 of IPC and Sections 181 and 196 of Motor Vehicles Act, with Police Station Indora, District Kangra, H.P., as well as, the proceedings, resultant thereto, pending before the learned trial Court, are ordered to be quashed.

16. The compromise deed, Annexure P-3, and the statements of the parties, recorded today, shall form part of the judgment.

17. Pending miscellaneous applications, if any, shall also stand disposed of accordingly.

**( Virender Singh )**  
**Judge**

**24<sup>th</sup> December, 2025**  
*(Pramod Kumar)*