

2026:PHHC:005109



**IN THE PUNJAB AND HARYANA HIGH COURT AT
CHANDIGARH**

123

CRM-M-56353-2025
Date of Decision: 13.01.2026

KULDEEP SINGH @ KULDEEP SINGH RATHI

... Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANR.

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL.

Present: Mr. Ashish Rana, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Tapan Masta, Addl. A.G. Haryana
for respondent No.1.

Mr. Vivek Dahiya, Advocate for
Mr. Vishavjeet Singh, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

This petition has been filed under Section 528 of Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking quashing of FIR No.820 dated 23.07.2016 under Sections 120-B, 379, 380, 420, 448, 452, 465, 467, 468, 471 and 504 of IPC (Sections 379, 380, 448 and 452 of IPC deleted later on) registered at Police Station Chandni Bagh, District Panipat (Annexure P-1) alongwith all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 26.09.2025 arrived at between the parties (Annexure P-2).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the matter has been compromised between the parties by virtue of compromise deed dated 26.09.2025 (Annexure P-3) duly executed between the petitioner and the complainant out of their free will and without any coercion or undue influence.

Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the FIR in question has already been quashed qua other co-accused persons namely Virender Deswal and Vipin Singhal vide orders dated 17.01.2023 (Annexure P-3) and 24.07.2023 (Annexure P-4) passed by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in CRM-M-40458-2022 and CRM-M-14659-2023 respectively. He further submits that now the complainant has compromised the matter with the present petitioner also and therefore, he prays that the FIR in question may be quashed qua the present petitioner too.

3. Learned State Counsel has filed a detailed reply on behalf of respondent No.1-State and has prayed for dismissal of the present petition being devoid of merits.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant-respondent No.2 does not dispute the factum of compromise and submits that respondent No.2 has no objection if the FIR in question is quashed qua the present petitioner also.

5. In view of the above, no useful purpose would be served to continue with the proceedings before the trial Court in the instant FIR, especially when the matter has already been compromised by the complainant with the other co-accused persons.

6. In that view of the matter, even if this case is taken to its logical conclusion, it would only be an exercise in futility as the parties have already settled their differences. Therefore, no purpose would be served in wasting the time and resources of the State in pursuing this case to its pre-ordained end. It would, therefore, be better to give a quietus to the issue at this stage.

6. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and FIR No.820 dated 23.07.2016 under Sections 120-B, 379, 380, 420, 448, 452, 465, 467, 468, 471 and 504 of IPC (Sections 379, 380, 448 and 452 of IPC deleted later on) registered at Police Station Chandni Bagh, District Panipat (Annexure P-1) alongwith all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom are quashed qua the petitioner on the basis of compromise dated 26.09.2025 arrived at between the parties (Annexure P-2) subject to costs of Rs.10,000/- to be deposited with Punjab and Haryana High Court Legal Services Committee, Chandigarh.

7. Petition stands allowed accordingly.

JANUARY 13, 2026.
Rajender

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No