

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

**Cr.MMO No. 952 of 2026**

**Decided on: 01.09.2026**

---

Ravi Kumar ..... petitioner  
Versus

State of H.P. and another respondents

---

Coram:

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

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

---

**For the petitioner** : Mr. Uday Singh Banyal, Advocate.  
**For the respondents** : Mr. Prashant Sen, Deputy Advocate General, for respondent No.1.  
: Mr. Tejasvi Verma, Advocate, for respondent No.2/complainant.

---

**Bipin Chander Negi, Judge (oral)**

The petitioner (accused), after compromising the matter with respondent No.2 (complainant), has approached this Court under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for quashing of FIR No. 101 of 2023, dated 20.07.2023, registered under Sections 452, 323, 504 and 506 of the IPC, at Police Station Barsar, District Hamirpur, H.P., as well as consequential judicial proceedings arising out of the same.

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

3. The averments contained in the petition, which are duly supported by an affidavit, reveal that on 20.07.2023, complainant/respondent No.2 had got a FIR registered against the

---

<sup>1</sup> Whether the reporters of the local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?

petitioner under Sections 452, 323, 504 and 506 of the IPC. However, during the pendency of the proceedings, the dispute inter se the parties has been settled amicably vide compromise dated 11.08.2026, a copy whereof is appended along with the present petition as Exhibit P-2.

4. Today, respondent No.2 (complainant) and the petitioner (accused) are present before this Court. The statements of both the petitioner and respondent No.2 (complainant) have been separately recorded and placed on the file.

5. From the statements made, it is evident that the petitioner and respondent No.2 are related and reside in the same village as neighbours. In the aforesaid facts and attending circumstances, with the intervention of the respectable persons of the area and in order to maintain amicable and cordial relationship inter se the parties, a compromise (Exhibit P-2), dated 11.08.2026, has been entered into inter se the parties. Respondent No.2/complainant categorically stated that the compromise had been effected out of his own free will and without any coercion, duress or pressure and that he has no objection if the FIR in the case at hand, based on the compromise, is quashed.

6. In the aforesaid facts and attending circumstances, reliance has been placed upon the judgment passed by the Coordinate Bench of this Court in ***Cr.MMO No. 638 of 2023, titled Manohar Lal and others vs. State of H.P. and others***, decided on 03.08.2023, wherein the FIR registered on pari materia provisions

had been quashed post compromise having been entered into inter se the accused and the complainant therein. In view of the aforesaid factual and legal matrix, I am of the considered view that no useful purpose would be served by continuing the proceedings against the petitioner/accused and the ends of justice demand that the dispute between the parties be put to an end. This Court sees no impediment in quashing the FIR in issue, as the dispute inter se the parties stands amicably resolved.

7. Consequently, the present petition is allowed, and FIR No. 101 of 2023, dated 20.07.2023, under Sections 452, 323, 504 and 506 of the IPC, registered at Police Station Barsar, District Hamirpur, H.P., as well as consequential proceedings arising out of the same are ordered to be quashed.

8. The petition stands disposed of in the above terms, so also the pending application(s), if any.

**(Bipin Chander Negi)**  
**Judge**

**01<sup>st</sup> September, 2026**  
(Tarun Singh)