IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH AT SHIMLA

Cr.MMO No.1112 of 2026
Decided on 19.11.2026

Amrish Rana …Petitioner

Versus

State of H.P. & Anr. …Respondents

Coram
Hon'ble Mr. Justice Chirag Bhanu Singh, Judge.
[1]Whether approved for reporting?

For the petitioner: Ms. Sheetal Vyas, Advocate.

For the respondents: Mr. Prashant Sen, Deputy Advocate General, for respondent No.1.

Mr. Yug Singhal, Advocate, for respondent No.2.

Chirag Bhanu Singh, Judge *(Oral)*

The present petition has been filed under Section 528 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (hereinafter referred to as the 'BNSS'), seeking the quashing of FIR No.168 of 2026, dated 23.09.2026, registered under Sections 126(2) & 118(1) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (hereinafter referred to as the BNS), at Police Station Kangra, District Kangra, H.P., and all the consequential proceedings arising thereto, on the basis of a compromise.

2. Though the FIR had come to be registered for the offences referred hereinabove *supra*, but subsequently, even

Section 109 of BNS had been incorporated. Primarily the allegations in the said FIR was that the petitioner/accused had apparently hit the vehicle of the respondent No.2/complainant and during the ensuing tiff injured his hand. Subsequently, the parties have now amicably settled the dispute, while compromising the matter. The compromise has been placed on record as (Annexure P-2).

3. During the pendency of the present proceedings, the parties have put an apperance before this Court on 03.11.2026, the respondent No.2/complainant in uncertain terms had deposed that he had sustained injuries, when the car of the petitioner/accused hit his motorcycle. The petitioner/accused had compensated him for the medical expenses and thereupon, the parties have voluntarily entered into a compromise without any undue influence or coercion from any quarter. The compromise deed (Annexure P-2) bears his signatures.

4. The petitioner/accused had also reiterated the same and deposed that he had voluntarily entered into a compromise and the compromise deed also bears his signatures.

5. Apparently, the parites have compromised the matter and thereafter the petitioner/accused had compensated the respondent No.2/complainannt for the damages sustained. No fruitful purpose thus would be served keeping in view the FIR pending.

6. It is more than apparent that the compromise placed on record has been effected volunartily and without any coercion from any quarter. Both the parties have vouches for the same in the Court too.

7. It is by now well settled that apart from quashing compoundable offences, this Court indeed has sufficient powers to even quash the proceedings involving non-compoundable offences.

8. In view of the compromise so entered *inter se* the parties, while exercising the inherent powers of this Court under Section 528 of BNSS., this Court can indeed quash the proceedings though having due regard to the nature and gravity of the crime and its impact on the society at large. Generally, heinous offenses of mental depravity, murder, rape, dacoity etc. may not come within the purview of the same, but offenses arising from commercial, financial, mercantile and civil partnership, matrimonial

or family disputes, where the wrong is basically private or personal in nature may be given a quietus, excising such powers.

9. The quashing of proceedings though must still not tantamount to the abuse of the process of law. The aforesaid proposition already stands answered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in no uncertain terms in ***Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab & Anr. (2012) 10 SCC 303***.

10. In the case at hand, since the parties have already amicably resolved the dispute, no effective purpose would be served in continuing with the criminal litigation. Since the dispute has been settled by the parties voluntarily and separate statement in this behalf already stands recorded and placed on the file, it would indeed be in the interest of justice and fair play that the criminal proceedings are put to an end, more so, keeping in view the burgeoning pendency of cases. The unwanted cases can be given a quietus enabling the Courts to give due weightage and time to the deserving cases on its docket.

11. Seeing to the nature of allegations and gravity of the offences mentioned in the FIR too, this Court will be well within its jurisdiction to quash the criminal proceedings against the accused

and it is ordered accordingly.

12. As a squeal, the FIR No.168 of 2026, dated 23.09.2026, registered for the commission of offences punishable under Sections 126(2) & 118(1) of BNS at Police Station Kangra, District Kangra, H.P., and all the consequential proceedings arising out of the said FIR are quashed and set aside. Ordered accordingly.

13. Accordingly, the petition is disposed off, so also the pending application(s),if any.

(Chirag Bhanu Singh)
Judge

November 19, 2026
(subhash sharma)