



CRM-M-14996-2025

-1-

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

292

CRM-M-14996-2025

Date of decision : 06.08.2025

Jagdish

..... Petitioner

V/S

State of Haryana and Ors.

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI

Present: Mr. Raman Chawla, Advocate for petitioner.

Mr. Ayuwan Singh, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Mohit Pilonia, Advocate for respondent No.2 & 3.

AMARJOT BHATTI J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioner – Jagdish has filed this petition under Section 528 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for quashing of FIR No.0179 dated 05.06.2024, registered under Sections 323, 354, 354-B, 506 of IPC 1860 at Police Station Adampur, District Hisar (Annexure P-1) and all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, qua the petitioner, in light of the compromise effected between the parties dated 10.03.2025 (Annexure P-2) and affidavit dated 10.03.2025 (Annexure P-3).

2. As per facts of the case, complainant 'P' gave her statement that she along with her sister 'M' were married in the same family to the cousins of Village Dhani, Mohabatpur. Out of this wedlock, both sisters had one child each. The victim 'P' was married to Mukesh and sister 'M' was married to Dara Singh. Due to quarrel in the family, her sister-in-law Sonu and Monika came to their house and took away their brothers along with them. They stayed in the matrimonial home with a hope that after sometime, their husband will return back but they did not come back. On 03.06.2024, their uncle-in-law Jagdish came to their house and by giving threats



took their jewellery including gold ornaments. Again on 05.06.2024 at about 10:30 PM, Jagdish came and when she came to the room to give him tea, he caught hold of her hand and pulled her inside. He started molesting her with bad intention and had also torn her clothes. On the alarm raised by her, her sister 'M' reached there who was pushed away by her father-in-law. She also fell down. He threatened her not to tell anything to anybody otherwise he would kill her. She called her brother Vijay. Police was informed and finally, the report was lodged. With these allegations present, FIR has been registered.

3. Learned counsel for petitioner argued that allegations detailed in the FIR are false. Matter has been compromised with the intervention of panchayat and common friends. All their disputes have been sorted out. The compromise dated 10.03.2025 is (Annexure P-2) and affidavit of complainant 'P' is (Annexure P-3). The FIR has been registered due to misunderstanding and the challan has been presented. No offence is made out. The continuation of trial is unnecessary and misuse of the criminal procedure. Therefore, the present court by using inherent powers may quash the FIR and the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom by accepting the present petition.

4. Mr. Mohit Pilania, Advocate appeared on behalf of respondents No.2 & 3 and confirmed the compromise arrived at between the parties.

5. Status report is filed confirming the facts detailed in the FIR. It is pointed out that proper investigation was carried out and the statements of witnesses were recorded. Torn clothes produced by respondent No.2/complainant were taken into police possession. Petitioner was arrested on 15.06.2024. The investigation was completed and challan was presented on 22.07.2024. Charges were framed vide order dated 08.11.2024 and the prosecution witnesses are being examined. At present, two prosecution witnesses have been examined. Their testimonies are

**CRM-M-14996-2025****-3-**

annexed with supplementary status report as Annexure R-1 & R-2. Considering the aforesaid factual position, petition filed by petitioner deserves dismissal.

6. I have considered the arguments and have gone through the record. As per the status report, present petitioner has been charge-sheeted under Sections 323, 354, 354-B, 506 of IPC. Statement of complainant was also recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C. On completion of investigation, challan was presented. The offences for which petitioner has been charge-sheeted are non-compoundable offences. During the course of trial, prosecution has examined the complainant 'P' as PW-1 and eyewitness 'M' as PW-2 on 25.02.2025 (Annexure R-1 & R-2). Perusal of their testimonies indicate that both witnesses did not support the prosecution version and were declared hostile and thereafter cross-examined by Public Prosecutor for the State and cross-examined by counsel for accused. After recording the statements of both the witnesses on 25.02.2025, present petition has been filed for quashing of FIR on 17.03.2025 on the basis of one compromise dated 10.03.2025 (Annexure P-2) and affidavit of complainant 'P' dated 10.03.2025 (Annexure P-3). Therefore, it is clear that these documents have been scribed when the aforesaid witnesses were already examined before the learned trial Court and had not supported the prosecution case. Once the trial has commenced and the testimony of material prosecution witnesses have been examined, I do not find it appropriate to quash the FIR. The trial will take its own course. Without commenting on the testimonies of prosecution witnesses as well as alleged compromise arrived at between the parties, the petition filed by petitioner is accordingly declined.

(AMARJOT BHATTI)
JUDGE

06.08.2025.*Sunil Devi*

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable:	Yes/No