IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

Cr. MMO No. 975 of 2026

Reserved on: 06.11.2026

Date of Decision: 20.11.2026.

Ravinder Agnihotri .... Petitioner

Versus

State of HP & Ors. .... Respondents

Coram

Hon'ble Mr Justice Rakesh Kainthla, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting?[1] ***No.***

For the Petitioner : Mr Suneet Verma, Advocate.

For Respondents No.1/State : Mr Ajit Sharma, Deputy Advocate General.

For Respondents No.2 and 3 : Ms Meghna Kashava, Advocate.

Rakesh Kainthla, Judge

The petitioner has filed the present petition for quashing of FIR No. 85 of 2026, dated 04.07.2026, registered at Police Station Dhanotu, District Mandi, H.P., for the commission of offences punishable under Sections 281 and 125(a) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (BNS) and Section 187 of Motor Vehicles Act (MV Act) and the consequential proceedings arising

[1] Whether reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgment? Yes.

2026:HHC:50164

out of the said FIR based on the compromise effected between the parties.

2. It has been asserted that the parties have compromised the matter with the intervention of respectable persons and well-wishers without any influence or coercion. The informant and victims do not want to proceed further with the matter after the compromise. The continuation of the proceedings would not serve any fruitful purpose. Hence, the petition.

3. The statements of the informant, Sahil Verma, and the victim, Neeraj, were recorded on 24.09.2026, wherein they stated that they had entered into a compromise with the petitioner voluntarily, without any threat, coercion, or undue influence from any person, and that they do not want to proceed further with the matter in view of the compromise. The victim, Akhil, made a statement on 28.09.2026 stating that he had not sustained any injuries in the incident, which was corroborated by the status report filed by the police.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the records carefully.

2026:HHC:50164

5. The offences punishable under Sections 281 and 125 (a) of BNS correspond to Sections 279 and 337 of IPC. This Court has already quashed the F.I.R. registered for the commission of offences punishable under Sections 279 and 337 of the IPC in ***Sushant vs. State of H.P. 2023 HLJ 531, Vikas Huda vs. State of H.P. 2023 STPL 3009, Kulvinder Singh vs. Ankush Kumar 2023 HLR 384*** and ***Nishant vs. State 2022 Suppl. Shim Law Cases 45,*** based on compromise between the parties. This Court has also quashed the F.I.R. registered for the commission of an offence punishable under Section 187 of the MV Act, *inter alia,* in ***Rajender Thakur Vs. State of H.P. and others, 2022 STPL 10700 HP*** and ***Akshay Kumar and others Vs. State of HP and others, 2022 STPL 9456 HP.*** These judgments are binding on this Court.

6. In view of these binding precedents, the present petition is allowed, and the FIR No. 85 of 2026, dated 04.07.2026, registered at Police Station Dhanotu, District Mandi, H.P., for the commission of offences punishable under Sections 281 and 125(a) of BNS and Section 187 of MV Act is ordered to be quashed. Consequent upon the quashing of the FIR, criminal proceedings pending/initiated against the petitioner-accused in pursuance thereto are also ordered to be quashed.

2026:HHC:50164

7. Petition stands disposed of in the above terms, so also pending miscellaneous applications, if any.

8. Parties are permitted to produce a copy of this judgment, downloaded from the webpage of the High Court of Himachal Pradesh, before the authorities concerned, and the said authorities shall not insist on the production of a certified copy, but if required, may verify the passing of the order from the Website of the High Court.

(Rakesh Kainthla)
Judge

20th November, 2026
(Chander)