

18.06.2026
Serial no. 35 & 48
Ct. No. 5
PIYA

CRR 181 of 2026
+
IA No.: CRAN 1 of 2026

John Barla
Vs.
The State of West Bengal & Anr.

With

CRR 116 of 2026

Adip Bhujel
Vs.
The State of West Bengal & Anr.

Mr. Shubhankar Dutta
Ms. Somdutta Patra
....for the Petitioner in
CRR 181 of 2026

Dr. Arjun Chowdhury
Mr. Janardhan Periwal
Ms. Riya Agarwal
.....for the Petitioner in
CRR 116 of 2026

Mr. Debajit Kundu
..... for the Complainant
in CRR 181 of 2026

Mr. Avrojoyti Das, Ld. APP
Mr. Gobinda Ghosh
..... For the State

1. The two revisional applications have been preferred praying for quashing of FIR, Charge Sheet and proceedings arising out of Banarhat P.S. Case No. 259/2021 dated 28.07.2021 under Sections 493/376/506/509/417/420/342/34 of the Indian Penal Code read with Section 3(1)(xii) of the SC/ST (POA) Act, and Chargesheet No. 247/22 dated 29.06.2022 under

Sections 493/376/506/509/417/420/342/34 of the Indian Penal Code read with Section 3(1)(xii) of the SC/ST (POA) Act Pending before the Learned Additional District and Session Judge 1st Court at Jalpaiguri (corresponding Special Case No. 10 of 2021).

2. **CRAN 1 of 2026** filed, is a joint application on affidavit stating that the parties have arrived at an amicable settlement in the present case and the complainant/opposite party does not have any grievance if the proceedings in the present case is quashed respect of the petitioner in CRR 181 of 2026.
3. A Three Judge Bench of the Court in **(2012) 10 Supreme Court Cases, 303, Gian Singh vs State of Punjab** and another has cleared the position in respect of the power of the High Court in quashing a criminal proceedings in exercise of its inherent jurisdiction in para 61 of the judgment, which is reproduced here in:-

“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 FIR 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 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 the 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 the 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."

4. In Anita Maria Dias & Anr. vs The State of Maharashtra & Anr. (2018) 3 SCC 290.

The Court held:-

(a) *Offences which are predominant of civil character, commercial transaction should be quashed when parties have resolved their dispute.*

(b) *Timing of settlement would be crucial for exercise of power or declining to exercise power (stage of proceedings).*

5. In *Madhukar & Ors. vs State of Maharashtra & Anr.*, 2025 SCC OnLine SC 1415, decided on July 14, 2025,

the Supreme Court held:-

“5. It is brought to our attention that both parties have categorically taken the stand before this Court that they have resolved their disputes amicably and are desirous of moving on with their lives. The complainant in the 2nd FIR, now married and residing with her husband, has expressed that continuation of the prosecution would cause further disruption in her personal life and that she has no wish to support the charges or pursue the matter any further.

6. At the outset, we recognise that the offence under Section 376 IPC is undoubtedly of a grave and heinous nature. Ordinarily, quashing of proceedings involving such offences on the ground of settlement between the parties is discouraged and should not be permitted lightly. However, the power of the Court under Section 482 CrPC to secure the ends of justice is not constrained by a rigid formula and must be exercised with reference to the facts of each case.”

6. The joint application being CRAN 1 of 2026 filed by the parties clearly shows that an amicable settlement and compromise has been arrived at between the parties and **the complainant does not wish to proceed with the criminal case against the petitioner John Barla (CRR 181 of 2026),** being

proceeding in Banarhat P.S. Case No. 259/2021 dated 28.07.2021 under Sections 493/376/506/509/417/420/342/34 of the Indian Penal Code read with Section 3(1)(xii) of the SC/ST (POA) Act, and Chargesheet No. 247/22 dated 29.06.2022 under Sections 493/376/506/509/417/420/342/34 of the Indian Penal Code read with Section 3(1)(xii) of the SC/ST (POA) Act Pending before the Learned Additional District and Session Judge 1st Court at Jalpaiguri (Special Case No. 10 of 2021).

7. From the materials on record, it appears, that dispute in the present case arises out of a personal dispute. The dispute is personal in nature. The parties have now resolved their entire dispute by way of a compromise/settlement on affidavit and as such 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 could be caused to them by not quashing the criminal case despite full and complete settlement and compromise with the complainant, as in the words of the Supreme Court in **(Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab and another, (Supra))**.

8. So far as the allegations against the petitioner in CRR 116 of 2026 is concerned, it appears that there is nothing on record to substantiate the offences as

alleged in respect of the petitioner Adip Bhujel, though no amicable settlement has taken place with this petitioner.

9. As such, this court is of the view that it would be unfair and contrary to the interest of justice to continue with the criminal proceedings which would tantamount to abuse of process of law in view of the settlement arrived at between the parties in respect of their dispute and also the material on record against petitioner Adip Bhujel and also to secure the ends of justice, it would be prudent to quash the proceedings in the case as prayed for.

10. **The revisional application being CRR 181 of 2026 is accordingly allowed, on compromise and CRR 116 of 2026 is allowed on the basis of materials on record.**

11. Accordingly, the proceedings arising out of Banarhat P.S. Case No. 259/2021 dated 28.07.2021 under Sections 493/376/506/509/417/420/342/34 of the Indian Penal Code read with Section 3(1)(xii) of the SC/ST (POA) Act, and Chargesheet No. 247/22 dated 29.06.2022 under Sections 493/376/506/509/417/420/342/34 of the Indian Penal Code read with Section 3(1)(xii) of the SC/ST (POA) Act Pending before the Learned Additional District and Session Judge 1st Court at Jalpaiguri (Special Case No. 10 of 2021), **is hereby quashed in**

respect of the petitioners namely John Barla and Adip Bhujel.

- 12.** All connected Applications, if any, stands disposed of.
- 13.** Interim order, if any, stands vacated.
- 14.** Copy of this order be sent to the learned Trial Court for necessary compliance.
- 15.** Urgent certified website copy of this order, if applied for, be supplied expeditiously after complying with all, necessary legal formalities.

(Shampa Dutt (Paul), J.)