

2025:PHHC:164781



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

129

CRM-M-64919-2025

Decided on:18.11.2025

Ajit**...Petitioner****Versus****State of Haryana and another****...Respondents****Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice Rajesh Bhardwaj**

Present: Mr. Gourav, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J.

1. Prayer in the present petition, filed under Section 528 of the BNSS, 2023, is for quashing the FIR No.179 dated 07.07.2025, registered under Sections 420 and 406 of IPC, 1860, at Police Station Sahlawas, District Jhajjar.

2. Succinctly, the facts of the present case are that the FIR in question was lodged on the complaint of Jogender, in which it was alleged that Ajit son of Ramkishan (petitioner herein) came to his house on 15.09.2019 at about 09.00 am and during conversation, he told him that his son Sumit is in search of the job and if he applies for his selection in Navy, he would provide him a job there, for which the complainant would have to pay Rs.10,00,000/-. On this conversation, the deal was struck and on his saying, the complainant paid Rs.4,80,000/- to the petitioner on 19.09.2019, however, he found that when the result came, name of his son was not in the selection list. On this, he asked the petitioner to return his money; however, he stopped picking up his phone. The Panchayat was convened for resolving the dispute but Ajit threatened him with dire consequences. Finding himself to be cheated by Ajit, he lodged the complaint with the request to take legal action against Ajit. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced and the case is now under investigation.

2025:PHHC:164781



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been falsely and frivolously implicated in the present case due to personal enmity and professional jealousy harboured by certain individuals. It is submitted that there is a delay of almost 6 years in lodging the FIR. He further submitted that the complainant has not given any detail regarding the alleged payment to the petitioner and even otherwise, the dispute, if any, is of civil nature and the FIR in itself is not maintainable. He relied upon the judgments of the Supreme Court rendered in the case of **Delhi Race Club (1940) Limited and others vs. State of Uttar Pradesh and another**, (2024) 10 SCC 690 and in the case of **Vesa Holdings Private Limited and another vs. State of Kerala and others**, 2015(8) SCC 293 in support of his contentions and prayed for quashing of the FIR.

4. After hearing learned counsel for the petitioner and perusing the available record, it is deciphered that there are specific allegations against the petitioner of having received an amount of Rs.4,80,000/- from the complainant for making illegal deal with him with a false promise of providing job to his son in Navy. The petitioner has duped the complainant with a huge amount, *prima facie*, complicity of the petitioners has been established and admittedly, the case is under investigation.

5. Hon'ble the Supreme Court in the case of **State of Haryana vs. Bhajan Lal**, 1992 Supp (1) SCC 335 has held that the High Court has inherent power under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing the FIR, however, the same should not be exercised for the offence falling under the heinous categories. It has been further observed in **Bhajan Lal's (supra)** as under:-

“102. In the backdrop of the interpretation of the various relevant provisions of the Code under Chapter XIV and of the principles of law enunciated by this Court in a series of decisions relating to the exercise of the extraordinary power under Article 226 or the inherent powers under Section 482 of the Code which we have extracted and reproduced above,

2025:PHHC:164781



we give the following categories of cases by way of illustration wherein such power could be exercised either to prevent abuse of the process of any Court or otherwise to secure the ends of justice, though it may not be possible to lay down any precise, clearly defined and sufficiently channelized and inflexible guidelines or rigid formulae and to give an exhaustive list of myriad kinds of cases wherein such power should be exercised:

- (1) Where the allegations made in the first information report or the complaint, even if they are taken at their face value and accepted in their entirety do not prima facie constitute any offence or make out a case against the accused.
- (2) Where the allegations in the first information report and other materials, if any, accompanying the FIR do not disclose a cognizable offence, justifying an investigation by police officers under Section 156(1) of the Code except under an order of a Magistrate within the purview of Section 155(2) of the Code.
- (3) Where the uncontroverted allegations made in the FIR or complaint and the evidence collected in support of the same do not disclose the commission of any offence and make out a case against the accused.
- (4) Where the allegations in the FIR do not constitute a cognizable offence but constitute only a non-cognizable offence, no investigation is permitted by a police officer without an order of a Magistrate as contemplated under Section 155(2) of the Code.
- (5) Where the allegations made in the FIR or complaint are so absurd and inherently improbable on the basis of which no prudent person can ever reach a just conclusion that there is sufficient ground for proceeding against the accused.

2025:PHHC:164781



(6) Where there is an express legal bar engrafted in any of the provisions of the Code or the concerned Act (under which a criminal proceeding is instituted) to the institution and continuance of the proceedings and/or where there is a specific provision in the Code or the concerned Act, providing efficacious redress for the grievance of the aggrieved party.

(7) Where a criminal proceeding is manifestly attended with mala fide and/or where the proceeding is maliciously instituted with an ulterior motive for wreaking vengeance on the accused and with a view to spite him due to private and personal grudge.”

6. Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab and another**, (2012) 10 SCC 303, has further held as under:-

“61. The position that emerges from the above discussion can be summarised thus: the power of the High Court in quashing a criminal proceeding or FIR or complaint in exercise of its inherent jurisdiction is distinct and different from the power given to a criminal court for compounding the offences under Section 320 of the Code. Inherent power is of wide plenitude with no statutory limitation but it has to be exercised in accord with the guideline engrafted in such power viz; (i) to secure the ends of justice, or (ii) to prevent abuse of the process of any Court. In what cases power to quash the criminal proceeding or complaint or F.I.R may be exercised where the offender and the victim have settled their dispute would depend on the facts and circumstances of each case and no category can be prescribed. However, before exercise of such power, the High Court must have due regard to the nature and gravity of the crime. Heinous and serious offences of mental depravity or offences like murder, rape, dacoity, etc. cannot be fittingly quashed even though the victim or victim's family and the offender have settled the dispute. Such offences are not private in nature

2025:PHHC:164781



and have a serious impact on society. Similarly, any compromise between the victim and the offender in relation to the offences under special statutes like the Prevention of Corruption Act or the offences committed by public servants while working in that capacity, etc; cannot provide for any basis for quashing criminal proceedings involving such offences. But the criminal cases having overwhelmingly and predominatingly civil flavour stand on a different footing for the purposes of quashing, particularly the offences arising from commercial, financial, mercantile, civil, partnership or such like transactions or the offences arising out of matrimony relating to dowry, etc. or the family disputes where the wrong is basically private or personal in nature and the parties have resolved their entire dispute. In this category of cases, the High Court may quash criminal proceedings if in its view, because of the compromise between the offender and the victim, the possibility of conviction is remote and bleak and continuation of the criminal case would put the accused to great oppression and prejudice and extreme injustice would be caused to him by not quashing the criminal case despite full and complete settlement and compromise with the victim. In other words, the High Court must consider whether it would be unfair or contrary to the interest of justice to continue with the criminal proceeding or continuation of the criminal proceeding would tantamount to abuse of process of law despite settlement and compromise between the victim and the wrongdoer and whether to secure the ends of justice, it is appropriate that criminal case is put to an end and if the answer to the above question(s) is in the affirmative, the High Court shall be well within its jurisdiction to quash the criminal proceeding.”

2025:PHHC:164781



7. Further, Hon'ble the Supreme Court in the case of **Neeharika Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. vs. State of Maharashtra and another**, 2021 SCC Online SC 315 has held that the High Court should exercise the power of quashing under Section 482 Cr.P.C. sparingly with great circumspection and sparingly, as it has been observed, in the rarest of rare cases and also criminal proceedings ought not to be scuttled at the initial stage.

8. The contentions raised by learned counsel for the petitioner regarding no connection of the petitioner in the offence alleged, is totally a disputed question of facts, which can be gone into by the trial Court only after appreciation of evidence led by respective parties. However, this Court cannot decide the issue involved in this case by invoking its inherent power under Section 482 Cr.P.C. especially when the case is under investigation and even challan has not been presented so far. Even the judgments relied upon by the learned counsel for the petitioner are distinguishable on facts as well as on the law.

9. Weighing the facts and circumstances of the case on the anvil of law settled, this Court finds that case in hand fails to qualify for invoking the inherent jurisdiction. Resultantly, the present petition being devoid of any merit is hereby dismissed.

10. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

November 18, 2025
vinod*

(Rajesh Bhardwaj)
Judge

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: NO/YES
Whether Reportable: NO/YES