



**In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
at Chandigarh**

118

CRM-M-32298-2023 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 16.04.2026

Babu Ram ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others ... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present:- Mr. Raj Kumar Arya, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Anup Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Geeteshwar Saini, Advocate for
Mr. Sandeep Kumar, Advocate,
for respondents No.3 to 7.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

1. This petition has been filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. for quashing of complaint NO/CHI-744 of 2020 dated 22.09.2020 titled ‘State Vs. Babu Ram’, filed under Section 195 of Cr.P.C. (annexure P-3) registered vide report/GD No.19 dated 30.05.2019, under Section 182 of IPC at Police Station Purana Shala, District Gurdaspur alongwith consequent proceedings.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the matter has been compromised between the parties and the compromise deed is Annexure P-5. He further contended that since the alleged complaint was addressed to SSP, therefore, SHO could not be a competent authority to file Kalendra. Thus, it is liable to be quashed. Learned counsel placed reliance upon the judgment of Hon’ble Supreme Court in case titled ‘*Saloni Arora Vs. State of*



CRM-M-32298-2023 (O&M)

(2)

NCT of Delhi, in ***Criminal Appeal No.64 of 2017, decided on 10.01.2017 (SLP (Crl.) No.8184 of 2015)*** as well as judgments of this Court titled ***'State of Punjab Vs. Harpreet Singh'***, CRM-A-2806-2019, ***decided on 31.01.2020, 'Seema Raj Kaushik Vs. State of Haryana' CRM-M-23670 of 2014, decided on 19.07.2018 and 'Randhir Vs. State of Haryana', CRM-M-41076-2003, decided on 09.09.2003,*** as there is a prohibition engrafted by Section 195 of Criminal Porcedure Code, 1973 that the Court shall not take cognizance of any offence punishable under Sections 172 to 188 of Indian Penal Code unless a complaint in writing is made by a public servant concerned or by some other public servant to whom he is administratively subordinate.

3. Learned counsel for respondents No.3 to 7 has admitted the factum of compromise and pleaded that he has no objection if the complaint alongwith consequent proceedings is quashed. Learned State counsel has also no objection to the quashing of complaint on the basis of aforesaid compromise.

4. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties.

5. Since compromise has been effected between the parties and no objection has been raised to the quashing of the complaint, nothing remains to be adjudicated further in the present case. Therefore, continuation of the present proceedings between the parties would be a futile exercise and sheer wastage of time of the Court and thus, amounts to abuse of process of law.

6. This petition is allowed and complaint NO/CHI-744 of 2020 dated 22.09.2020 titled ***'State Vs. Babu Ram'***, filed under Section 195 of Cr.P.C. (Annexurue P-3) registered vide report/GD No.19 dated 30.05.2019,



CRM-M-32298-2023 (O&M) (3)

under Section 182 of IPC at Police Station Purana Shala, District Gurdaspur
alongwith consequential proceedings are hereby quashed qua the petitioner.

16.04.2026
Geeta

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking /reasoned	Yes / No
Whether Reportable	Yes / No