

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

Cr. MMO No.930 of 2026

Date of Decision : 02.09.2026

Promila Guleria

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh and another

.....Respondents

Coram:

The Hon'ble Mr. Justice Bipin Chander Negi, Judge

Whether approved for reporting?¹

For the petitioner : Ms. Anuja Mehta, Proxy Counsel.

For the respondents : Mr. Prashant Sen, Deputy Advocate General, for respondent No.1-State.

Ms. Aafreen Kaushal, Proxy Counsel, for respondent No.2.

Bipin Chander Negi, Judge (oral)

By way of instant petition filed under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, a prayer has been made on behalf of the petitioner for quashing of FIR No.153 of 2020 dated 06.07.2020, under Section 3(1)(s) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 and Section 506 of the Indian Penal Code, registered at Police Station, Joginder Nagar, District Mandi Himachal Pradesh, as well as consequent judicial proceedings arising therefrom in **Case No.44/2020** titled **State of Himachal Pradesh vs. Promila Guleria** pending before learned

Additional District & Sessions Judge, Joginder Nagar-II, District Mandi, Himachal Pradesh.

2. It has been asserted that petitioner and respondent No.2 are working in the same Office. The dispute *inter se* them had arisen due to some misunderstanding and now the parties have resolved their dispute, hence, it has been prayed that the FIR in question be quashed, so as to maintain peace and harmony *inter se* the parties.

3. Original Compromise Deed (Exhibit P-2) has been placed on record. As per the averments contained in the petition, which is duly supported by an affidavit, it is revealed that on 06.07.2020, complainant/ respondent No.2 had got a FIR registered against the present petitioner under Section 3(1)(s) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 and Section 506 of the Indian Penal Code. As a sequel thereto, Challan has been presented before the learned Trial Court. However, during the pendency of proceedings, the dispute *inter se* parties has been settled amicably vide Compromise Deed dated 08.07.2026, copy whereof, is appended along with the present petition. The Compromise has been entered into with the intervention of the Office colleagues and friends with an intent to maintain peace and harmony *inter se* parties.

4. Statements of complainant/respondent No.2 and accused-petitioner stand recorded. The complainant has categorically stated that she has entered into compromise of her own free will, volition and without any pressure. According to complainant/respondent No.2, the dispute

inter se parties stands amicably settled and she does not intend to pursue the matter further.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record carefully.

6. This Court sees no impediment in quashing the FIR in issue, as the dispute *inter se* the parties stands amicably resolved. It is permissible to quash a FIR based on a compromise effected between the parties under the provisions of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989. In this respect, reference can be made to the judgment of the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court, in **Cr.MMO No.378 of 2024** titled **Rasik Sharma vs. State of H.P. and another**, decided on 12.07.2024.

7. Besides the aforesaid, in the case at hand, the petitioner and respondent No. 2 work in the same Office. Dispute in question stands resolved at the behest of the Office colleagues and friends. The compromise, Exhibit P-2, has been entered into by the complainant/respondent No. 2 of her own free volition. Consequences of the compromise are well known to the complainant/respondent No. 2.

8. In the aforesaid legal and factual matrix, the petition is allowed. FIR No.153 of 2020 dated 06.07.2020, under Section 3(1)(s) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 and Section 506 of the Indian Penal Code, registered at Police Station, Joginder Nagar, District Mandi Himachal Pradesh, as well as consequent judicial proceedings arising therefrom in **Case No.44/2020**

titled ***State of Himachal Pradesh vs. Promila Guleria*** pending before learned Additional District & Sessions Judge, Joginder Nagar-II, District Mandi, Himachal Pradesh, are quashed.

9. Respondent No. 2/complainant is directed to deposit the money, if any, received by her on the registration of the FIR, before the District Welfare Officer, Mandi.

10. Petition stands disposed of in the above terms, so also pending miscellaneous applications, if any.

11. Parties are permitted to produce a copy of this judgment, downloaded from the webpage of the High Court of Himachal Pradesh before the authorities concerned, and the said authorities shall not insist on the production of a certified copy, but if required, may verify passing of the order from the website of the High Court.

September 02, 2026 (KS)

(Bipin Chander Negi)
Judge