

2025:PHHC:051408



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

CRM M-19503 of 2025

Date of Decision:08.04.2025

Yogesh and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE N.S.SHEKHAWAT

Present : Mr. Munish Gulati, Advocate, for the petitioners.

Mr. Rajinder Kumar Banku, DAG, Haryana.

N.S.SHEKHAWAT, J.

1. The petitioners have filed the present petition under Section 528 of the BNSS, 2023 with a prayer to quash the FIR No. 360 dated 19.09.2024 registered under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B IPC at Police Station City Sohna, Gurugram (Annexure P-1) and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, as the matter has been amicably settled between the parties vide compromise deed dated 31.01.2025 (Annexure P-2).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that the petitioners and other co-accused were falsely involved in the present case. The FIR was initially registered against six accused. However, three other accused, namely, R.K. Sishodiya, Advocate, Bank

Manager, Haryana Gramin Bank, Branch Sohana and Chand Sharma (Notary Public) had neither applied for bail nor had effected compromise with the complainant. However, all the three petitioners had compromised the matter with the complainant in the present case and the FIR and all subsequent proceedings emanating therefrom are liable to be quashed by this Court on the basis of compromise.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel submits that in the present case, the FIR was initially registered against six accused and only three accused have filed the instant petition for quashing of the FIR, on the basis of compromise. Consequently, the present petition is liable to be dismissed by this Court in view of the law laid down by the Division Bench of this Court in CRM M-48043 of 2023 titled as **“Rakesh Dass Vs. State of Haryana and another”** and connected cases, **(decided on 12.11.2024)**.

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

5. I find sufficient force in the submissions made by learned State counsel that in view of the law laid down by a Division Bench of this Court in **Rakesh Dass’s case (supra)** that a piecemeal settlement in a criminal case is not permissible in law. The Hon’ble Division Bench had clearly held in the said judgment that the piecemeal settlement in the criminal cases, where only some of the accused reach at a settlement while other remain excluded can severally disrupt the judicial process. These settlements can hinder

joint trials, complicate prosecution’s ability to prove collective criminal liability and empower the defence to challenge the integrity of the trial. Such situations create an unfair and inconsistent trial process, undermine the moral and legal integrity of the criminal justice system and may ultimately result in the abuse of the legal proceedings. Therefore, the Court should avoid accepting piecemeal settlements to maintain fairness and credibility of the justice system.

6. Thus, in view of the law laid down by a Division Bench of this Court in **Rakesh Dass’s case (supra)**, the present petition is not maintainable and is ordered to be dismissed.

08.04.2025
amit rana

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No