



CRM-M-16680-2025

-1-

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

260

CRM-M-16680-2025

Date of decision : 02.07.2025

Loveneet Singh

..... Petitioner

V/S

State of Punjab and Anr.

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI

Present: Mr. Abhishek Khullar, Advocate for petitioner.

Mr. Japjot Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Lovepreet Singh, Advocate for respondent No.2.

AMARJOT BHATTI J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioner-Loveneet Singh filed petition under Section 528 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for quashing of FIR No.131 dated 10.11.2022, registered under Sections 406, 498-A of IPC, at Police Station Shimlapuri, District Ludhiana and all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, qua the petitioners, in light of the compromise effected between the parties dated 21.03.2025 (Annexure P-1).

2. As per facts of the case, complainant Simran Panesar filed written complaint against her husband Loveneet Singh and other members of in-laws family for causing harassment on account of bringing less dowry and for further raising demand for more dowry. The complainant alleged that she was doing



CRM-M-16680-2025

-2-

MBA. She lost her father when she was five years old and she was looked after by her mother with great difficulty. She came in contact with Loveneet Singh at IVY Institute Dugri, Ludhiana where she had gone in connection with her job. Ultimately, their marriage was fixed. Her mother had given gold ring, expensive clothes, shagun etc. at the time of ring ceremony. Thereafter, marriage was performed on 04.08.2021 at Hotel Grand Marian, Dugri Road, Ludhiana. Again, her mother had given customary gifts in the shape of gold ornaments, blankets, cash and clothes etc. as detailed in the FIR. All her dowry articles were taken by her in-laws. She was not permitted to use her *Istridhan*. After marriage her husband and in-laws family were unhappy with the marriage and the dowry articles given at the time of marriage. She was illtreated in the matrimonial home. She has narrated various incidents which took place in the matrimonial home. Despite intervention of Panchayat, there was no change in their behaviour. She was sent to her parental house on 21.10.2021 and thereafter, she was told not to return back. With these allegations, present FIR has been registered.

3. Petitioner filed this petition for quashing of aforesaid FIR on the basis of compromise. Vide order dated 27.03.2025, petitioner and respondent No.2 were directed to appear before the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate for recording their statements on the basis of compromise. Detailed report regarding compromise has been received from the court of Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Ludhiana dated 03.04.2025. Statement of respondent No.2 has been recorded where she confirmed the compromise with petitioner. She confirmed that this compromise has been effected voluntarily, without any coercion or undue influence and she has no objection regarding quashing of FIR.



CRM-M-16680-2025

-3-

4. Petitioner- Loveneet Singh also confirmed this fact in his separate statement. Statement of HC Rohit Kumar is also recorded who confirmed that petitioner is not involved or declared as proclaimed offender in any other criminal case.

5. Therefore, from the report of Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Ludhiana it is clear that compromise has been effected between the parties without any pressure, coercion or undue influence. They have mutually settled all their claims arisen from matrimonial dispute. They have decided to part ways by filing joint petition under Section 13-B of Hindu Marriage Act. Matter has been settled in Rs.11,50,000/- out of which Rs.5,75,000/- were to be paid by petitioner to complainant at the time of recording of first motion statements and balance amount of Rs.5,75,000/- will be paid at the time of recording of second motion statements. Thereafter, they will be able to live independently in peace and harmony. No purpose would be served with the continuation of criminal proceedings.

6. Gainful reference can be made to the judgment of Larger Bench of Five Judges of this High Court cited in **2007(3) R.C.R. (Criminal) 1052 tilted as Kulwinder Singh and Ors. Vs. State of Punjab and Anr.,** where it was explained that 'there can never be any hard and fast category which can be prescribed to enable the court to exercise its power under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. The only principle that can be laid down is the one which has been incorporated in the section itself i.e. to prevent abuse of the process of any court or to secure the ends of justice.'



CRM-M-16680-2025

-4-

7. Therefore, by relying upon the ratio of the aforesaid judgment, no purpose would be served with the continuation of criminal proceedings. Considering these facts, the petition filed by the petitioner is accepted and FIR No. 131 dated 10.11.2022, registered under Sections 406, 498-A of IPC, at Police Station Shimlapuri, District Ludhiana and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom are quashed qua petitioner.

(AMARJOT BHATTI)
JUDGE

02.07.2025.

Sunil Devi

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