IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
Cr.M.P. No.3231 of 2025
------

1. Madhukar Singh, aged about 59 years, son of Ayodhya Singh, Director of Maa Tapo Construction Pvt. Ltd;
2. Sachin Kumar @ Sachin Singh, aged about 40 years, son of Madhukar Singh,
3. Man Singh @ Sunny Kumar, aged about 33 years, son of Madhukar Singh,

All residents of Singh More, Kalyanpur, PO: Hatia, PS: Jaganathpur, District – Ranchi (Jharkhand) 834003

… Petitioners

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand
2. Sunil Kumar Singh, Son of Late Ramnaresh Singh, resident of Village: Flat No.604, Krishna Apartment, PO & PS-Sukhdevnagar, District – Ranchi, One of the Directors of M/S Unifor Developers Pvt. Ld., Ranchi
3. Suraj Pratap Singh, Son of Late B.P. Singh, resident of Village: Asha Shri Garden, P.O. & P.S. Bariyatu, District – Ranchi, One of the Directors of M/S Unifor Developers Pvt. Ld.

… Opposite Parties

For the Petitioners : Mr. Yuvraj Singh, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Achinto Sen, Addl.P.P.
For the O.P. No.2&3: Mr. Karan Pandey, Advocate

P R E S E N T

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR CHOUDHARY

By the Court:- Heard the parties.

2. This Criminal Miscellaneous Petition has been filed invoking the jurisdiction of this Court under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 with the prayer to quash the entire criminal proceedings including the First Information Report in connection with Kotwali (Sukhdeo Nagar) P.S. Case No. 516 of 2014 corresponding to G.R. Case No. 3240 of 2014 in which charge sheet has been submitted and the First Information Report of the case was registered for the offences punishable under Sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 471, 34 of the Indian Penal Code, now pending before the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Ranchi.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned counsel for the opposite party No.2-informant and the opposite party No.3 being the partners of the informant jointly draw the attention of this Court towards Interlocutory Application No.10488 of 2026 which is supported by the separate affidavits of each of the petitioners as well as the opposite party No.2 & 3 and submit that therein, it has categorically been mentioned that with the intervention of common relatives and well-wishers, both the parties have amicably settled their dispute. It is next jointly submitted that in view of the compromise between the parties, the opposite party No.2 & 3 do not want to proceed with the case against the petitioners. It is then submitted that the dispute between the parties is basically a civil dispute. It is further submitted that in view of the compromise between the parties, the continuation of this criminal proceeding will amount to abuse of process of law; as in view of the compromise, the chance of conviction of the petitioners is

remote and bleak. Hence, it is submitted that the entire criminal proceedings including the First Information Report in connection with Kotwali (Sukhdeo Nagar) P.S. Case No. 516 of 2014 corresponding to G.R. Case No. 3240 of 2014, now pending before the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Ranchi, be quashed and set aside.

4. Learned Addl.P.P. appearing for the State submits that in view of the compromise between the parties, the State has no objection for quashing the entire criminal proceedings including the First Information Report in connection with Kotwali (Sukhdeo Nagar) P.S. Case No. 516 of 2014 corresponding to G.R. Case No. 3240 of 2014, now pending before the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Ranchi.

5. Having heard the rival submissions made at the Bar and after carefully going through the materials available in the record, it is pertinent to mention here that the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of **Parbatbhai Aahir @ Parbatbhai Bhimsinhbhai Karmur & Others vs. State of Gujarat & Another** reported in **(2017) 9 SCC 641,** had the occasion to consider the jurisdiction of the High Court under Section 482 of Code of Criminal Procedure *inter alia* on the basis of compromise between the parties and has held in paragraph No.11 as under:-

> ***"11.*** *Section 482 is prefaced with an overriding provision. The statute saves the inherent power of the High Court, as a superior court, to make such orders as are necessary (i) to prevent an abuse of the process of any court; or (ii) otherwise to secure the ends of justice. In Gian Singh [Gian Singh v. State of Punjab, (2012) 10 SCC 303 : (2012) 4 SCC (Civ) 1188 : (2013) 1 SCC (Cri) 160 : (2012) 2 SCC (L&S) 988] a Bench of three learned Judges of this Court adverted to the body of precedent on the subject and laid down guiding principles which the High Court should consider in*

determining as to whether to quash an FIR or complaint in the exercise of the inherent jurisdiction. The considerations which must weigh with the High Court are : (SCC pp. 342-43, para 61)

> *"61. … 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." (Emphasis supplied)"*

6. Perusal of the record reveals that the offences involved in this case are not heinous offences nor is there any serious offence of mental depravity is involved in this case rather the same relates to private dispute between the parties.

7. Because of the complete settlement between the offender and the victim, the possibility of conviction of the petitioners is remote and bleak and continuation of the criminal case would put the petitioners to great oppression and prejudice and extreme injustice would be caused to them by not quashing the criminal case, despite full and complete settlement and compromise with the victim.

8. Hence, this Court is of the considered view that this is a fit case where the entire criminal proceedings including the First Information Report in connection with Kotwali (Sukhdeo Nagar) P.S. Case No. 516 of 2014 corresponding to G.R. Case No. 3240 of 2014, now pending before the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Ranchi, be quashed and set aside against the petitioners named above.

9. Accordingly, the entire criminal proceedings including the First Information Report in connection with Kotwali (Sukhdeo Nagar) P.S. Case No. 516 of 2014 corresponding to G.R. Case No. 3240 of 2014, now

pending before the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Ranchi, is quashed and set aside against the petitioners named above.

10. In the result, this Criminal Miscellaneous Petition is allowed.

11. In view of disposal of the instant Criminal Miscellaneous Petition, I.A. No. 10488 of 2026 stands disposed of accordingly.

(Anil Kumar Choudhary, J.)

High Court of Jharkhand, Ranchi
Dated the 02nd of September, 2026
AFR/ Saroj

Uploaded on 03/09/2026