IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
Cr.M.P. No. 3279 of 2026

1. Shamshad Kureshi @ Gudan Kuraishi age 36 years son of Subhani Kuraishi, resident of village Chakaharbhonga, P.O. Sahpur, P.S. Chainpur, District Palamau.
2. Rinku @ Rinku Quraishi age 42 son of Asik Quraishi, Kasai Mohalla, Muslim Nagar, P.O. & P.S. Daltonganj, District Palamau.
3. Tannu Khan @ Tanvir Khan, age 38 years old, son of Jamin Khan, Resident of village Humbu, P.O. Chiru, P.S. Balumath, District Latehar. ..... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand
2. Ahmad Kamal son of Kalam Ansari, Resident of Village & P.O.- Shahpur, P.S. -Chainpur, District Palamau.

….. Opposite Parties

For the Petitioners : Mr. Sabyasanchi, Adv.
For the State : Mr. Shailesh Kr. Sinha, Addl. PP
For the O.P. No. 2 : Mr. Akash Kumar , Adv.
Mr. Rakesh Kumar , Adv.

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 BNSS, 2023 with the prayer for quashing and setting aside the entire criminal proceeding including the First Information Report being Chainpur P.S. case no. 321 of 2023 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 384, 385, 386, 387, 504, 506 of the IPC pending in the court of learned SDJM, Palamau at Daltonganj.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the investigation of the case is still going on and charge sheet has not been submitted as yet.
4. Drawing attention of the court to I.A. no. 14131 of 2026 which is supported by separate affidavits of the petitioner no. 1 who is

duly authorized to sworn this affidavit on behalf of the other petitioners as well as the informant – opp. Party no. 2, it is jointly submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioners and learned counsel for the opposite party no. 2 that therein it has categorically been mentioned that the petitioners are innocent and have falsely been implicated in this case because of the business rivalry but matter has been compromised between the parties and the entire dispute has been settled and sorted out, hence, the opposite party no. 2 is not interested in pursuing the case, therefore, the chance of conviction of the petitioners is remote and bleak. It is further submitted that the dispute between the parties is a private dispute and no public policy is involved in the case hence, continuation of the criminal proceeding in connection with Chainpur P.S. case no. 321 of 2023 will amount to abuse of the process of law and no purpose would be served in continuing with the criminal proceeding after compromise have been entered into between the parties, hence, it is jointly submitted that the entire criminal proceeding including the First Information Report being Chainpur P.S. case no. 321 of 2023, be quashed and set aside against the petitioners.

5. Learned Addl. PP submits that the State has no objection to the prayer of the petitioners to quash and set aside the entire criminal proceeding including the First Information Report being Chainpur P.S. case no. 321 of 2023 in view of the compromise between the parties.

6. Having heard the submissions made at the Bar and after 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 **Parbatbhai Aahir @ Parbatbhai Bhimsinhbhai Karmur and Others v. State of Gujarat and 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)*

7. Because of the compromise 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 accused

persons 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. In view of the submission made jointly by the learned counsel for the petitioners and learned counsel for the opposite party no. 2, this court is satisfied that the parties have amicably resolved their entire dispute. Thus, in the considered opinion of this Court, it would be unfair and contrary to the interest of justice to continue with the criminal proceeding and the continuance of criminal proceeding would tantamount to the abuse of the process of law and in the interest of justice, it is appropriate that the entire criminal proceeding against the petitioners be put to an end.
9. Accordingly, the entire criminal proceeding including the First Information Report being Chainpur P.S. case no. 321 of 2023, is quashed and set aside against the petitioners.
10. In the result, this criminal miscellaneous petition is allowed and in view of the disposal of this criminal miscellaneous petition, the I.A. No. 14131 of 2026 is also stands disposed of.

(Anil Kumar Choudhary, J.)

High Court of Jharkhand, Ranchi
Dated, the 28th October,2026
Smita / AFR

Uploaded on 02.11.2026