



CRM-M-28164-2025

-1-

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

269

CRM-M-28164-2025

Date of decision : 22.09.2025

Mamraj Saini and Anr.

..... Petitioners

V/S

State of Haryana and Anr.

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI

Present: Mr. Sandeep K.Sharma, Advocate for petitioners.

Mr. Ayuwan Singh, AAG, Haryana.

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

AMARJOT BHATTI J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioners – Mamraj Saini and Santosh have filed this petition under Section 528 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (Section 482 Cr.P.C.) for quashing of FIR No.99 dated 27.06.2017, registered under Sections 34, 406, 498-A, 506 of IPC 1860 at Women Police Station, District Rohtak (Annexure P-1), order dated 26.09.2017 (Annexure P-2) passed by learned JMIC, Rohtak and all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, qua the petitioners, in the light of compromise effected between the parties dated 17.05.2025 (Annexure P-4).

2. As per facts of the case, complainant/respondent No.2 - Poonam filed written complaint on the basis of which present FIR has been registered. She stated that her marriage was performed with Mamraj Saini on 22.01.2013, according to *Hindu Rites*. Her parents had given dowry beyond their means and



had spent Rs.5 lakhs on her marriage. Soon after marriage, she was harassed and beaten up for their demand of dowry. She was taunted by saying that she belongs to a poor family. There was demand for motorcycle. Her mother-in-law, brother-in-law, and sister-in-law were raising demand for gold jewellery. Out of this wedlock, she was having two children. She continued to bear cruel behaviour of her husband and members of in-laws family to save her marriage. She was threatened time and again on account of aforesaid demand. Finally, she filed the present complaint.

3. Petitioners filed this petition for quashing of aforesaid FIR on the basis of compromise. Vide order dated 22.05.2025, petitioners 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, Rohtak dated 13.06.2025. Statement of respondent No.2 has been recorded where she confirmed the compromise with petitioners. She confirmed that this compromise has been effected voluntarily, without any coercion or undue influence and she has no objection regarding quashing of FIR.

4. Petitioners- Mamraj Saini and Santosh have also confirmed this fact in their separate statements. Statement of ASI Pinki is also recorded who confirmed that petitioners are not involved or declared as proclaimed offenders in any other criminal case.

5. Therefore, from the report of Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Rohtak it is clear that the compromise has been effected between the parties without any pressure, coercion or undue influence, which is acceptable to both the parties.



CRM-M-28164-2025

-3-

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.1,70,000/-. Thereafter, they will be able to live independently in peace and harmony. It will end the litigation started between them.

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 titled 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.’

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 petitioners is accepted and FIR No.99 dated 27.06.2017, registered under Sections 34, 406, 498-A, 506 of IPC 1860 at Women Police Station, District Rohtak (Annexure P-1), order dated 26.09.2017 (Annexure P-2) passed by learned JMIC, Rohtak and all subsequent proceedings arisen therefrom are quashed qua petitioners – Mamraj Saini and Santosh.

(AMARJOT BHATTI)
JUDGE

22.09.2025.

Sunil Devi

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