IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

Cr.MMO No. 64 of 2026

Reserved on: 26.10.2026

Date of Decision: 23.11. 2026.

Aman Puri ....Petitioners

Versus

State of H.P. & others ....Respondents

Coram

Hon'ble Mr Justice Rakesh Kainthla, Judge.

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

For the petitioners	:	Mr Ajay Kochhar, Senior Advocate, with Ms Swati Sharma, Advocate.
For the respondent No.1	:	Mr P.K. Nadda, Additional Advocate General, for respondent No.1/State.
For the respondents No. 2 & 3	:	Ms Preetika Thakur, Advocate.

Rakesh Kainthla, Judge

The petitioner has filed the present petition for quashing of FIR No. 66 of 2024, dated 19.04.2024, registered at Police Station Shimla West, District Shimla, for the commission of

[1] Whether reporters of the local papers may be allowed to see the judgment? Yes

offences punishable under Sections 324 and 326 of the Indian Penal Code (IPC) and the consequential proceedings arising out of it, based on a compromise between the parties.

2. It has been asserted that the FIR was lodged because of a misunderstanding between the parties. The parties have entered into a compromise with the intervention of the respectable persons of the society. They are related to each other, and they do not want to pursue the matter after the compromise. No fruitful purpose would be served by continuing with the proceedings. Hence, it was prayed that the present petition be allowed and the FIR and consequential proceedings arising out of it be quashed.

3. The statements of the informant, Dr Naman Puri, and the injured, Mehak Puri, were recorded on 20.07.2026, in which they stated that they had entered into a compromise with the petitioner/accused voluntarily and they had no objection to quashing the FIR based on a compromise between the parties.

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

5. This Court has quashed the FIR registered for the commission of an offence punishable under Section 324 of IPC in

Ram Krishan alias Ramu vs. State of H.P.& others Latest HLJ 2021(2) (HP) 1327, Amir Hussain vs State of Himachal Pradesh 2022(1)Him.L.R.195, Braham Dass & others vs. State of H.P & others 2022(1) Him.L.R.466, Inderjeet Singh & others vs State of H.P. & others 2022(2)Him.LR.1217, Raj Kumar @ Raj & Ors. vs. State of Himachal Pradesh & Anr. Latest HLJ 2022(HP)(1) 759 and ***Rukam Deen Vs State of Himachal Pradesh 2023(1) Him. L.R. (HC) 616,*** based on compromise between the parties. This Court has held in ***Ram Kumar & others vs. State of H.P. 2016(4) Him. L.R. 2157, Naresh Katoch vs. State of H.P. & another 2019 (Suppl.) Him L.R. 2656, Kartik Sharma & others vs. State of H.P. 2020 STPL 4914 H P and Naykan Kamdak & others vs. State of H.P. 2020 STPL 6334 HP*** that the offence punishable under Section 326 of IPC can be quashed because of the compromise effected between the parties. These judgments are binding on this Court.

6. In view of these precedents, the present petition is allowed and FIR No. 66 of 2024, dated 19.04.2024, registered at Police Station Shimla West, District Shimla, for the commission of offences punishable under Sections 324 and 326 of the IPC, and the consequential proceedings arising out of the said F.I.R. are also ordered to be quashed.

7. Petition stands disposed of in the above terms, so also pending 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

23rd November, 2025
(Chander)