

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.64492 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-434 Year-2025 Thana- RAJIVNAGAR District- Patna

1. Sudhanshu Shekhar S/O Chandrashekhar Singh R/O Mohalla - Raghunathpur, Ward No. 29 (Near Bhaskar ITI), P.S- Raghunathpur, District- East Champaran (Bihar).
2. Chandrashekhar Singh S/O Dudhnath Singh R/O Mohalla - Raghunathpur, Ward No. 29 (Near Bhaskar ITI), P.S- Raghunathpur, District- East Champaran (Bihar).
3. Pushpa Devi W/O Chandrashekhar Singh R/O Mohalla - Raghunathpur, Ward No. 29 (Near Bhaskar ITI), P.S- Raghunathpur, District- East Champaran (Bihar).

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Smita Singh W/O Sudhanshu Shekhar, D/O Upendra Singh R/O Road No. 25, Rajiv Nagar, P.S- Rajiv Nagar, Distt.- Patna (Bihar).

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Sanjay Kumar Tiwari, Advocate
For the State	:	Mrs. Pronoti Singh, APP
For the O.P. No. 2	:	Mr. Anjani Kumar Jha, Advocate
		Ms. Anita Kumari Sharma, Advocate
		Mr. Vishwa Shri Rajender, Advocate
		Ms. Shaambhavi Sinha, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SOURENDRA PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

2 19-01-2026

Heard the learned counsel for the parties.

2. The present application has been filed by the petitioners for quashing the F.I.R being Rajiv Nagar P.S. Case No. 434 of 2025 dated 04.07.2025 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 85, 351(2), 352 and 3(5) of the B.N.S., 2023.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners at the outset



submit that the parties have settled the differences between them and a Settlement-cum-Compromise Petition has been filed on 01.08.2025 in the present case. It has been submitted that the petitioner and the O.P. No. 2 are living as husband and wife and they are together again and the O.P. No. 2 is presently residing with the petitioner.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the O.P. No. 2 does not dispute the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioners and has further stated that the parties have settled their differences and in fact the O.P. No. 2 is residing with the petitioner and in view of the above, she does not want to pursue the present criminal proceeding.

5. In view of the aforesaid submissions and taking into account the fact that the present case was lodged for offences under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 85, 351(2), 352 and 3(5) of the B.N.S., 2023 against the petitioners being husband, father-in-law and mother-in-law and the parties have compromised the dispute which is primarily matrimonial dispute, the continuation of proceedings would amount to abuse of the process of law.

6. Keeping in view the judicial pronouncement made in the case of *Narinder Singh v. State of Punjab*, (2014) 6 SCC



466, wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court has given the guidelines and laid down the principles by which the High Court would be guided in giving adequate treatment to the settlement between the parties and exercising its power under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C., while accepting the settlement and quashing the proceedings or in the alternative refusing to accept the settlement with a direction to continue with the criminal proceedings. The Hon'ble Supreme Court further elaborated that when the parties have reached the settlement and on that basis petition for quashing the criminal proceeding is filed, the guiding factor in such cases would be to secure:

(I) ends of justice,

(II) to prevent abuse of the process of any court.

7. Taking into account the facts of the case as well as judicial pronouncements, the criminal proceedings based on the F.I.R of Rajiv Nagar P.S. Case No. 434 of 2025 dated 04.07.2025 stands quashed.

8. The present application stands allowed.

(Sourendra Pandey, J)

aditya/manoj

U		T	
---	--	---	--

