



pocket of the complainant and fled away on their motorcycles. Hence, the FIR was registered against the petitioners.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the present FIR was registered on the basis of statement made by respondent No.2. Now, the compromise has been effected between the parties and respondent No.2 has no objection in case, the present FIR is quashed along with the subsequent proceedings.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Karan Veer Singh, Senior DAG, Haryana, accepted notice on behalf of respondent-State and filed reply by way of affidavit dated 06.02.2026 of Bharat Bhushan, HPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, HQ, Narnaul, District Mahendergarh, which is taken on record. Learned State counsel submitted that the petitioners are having criminal antecedents and they have fired three gun shots due to which, three persons got injured in this case. He further submitted that the matter in hand pertains to offence under Section 307 of IPC, which is heinous in nature and FIR can't be allowed to be quashed on the basis of compromise in such cases. To support his contentions, learned State counsel relied upon the judgment passed by Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***State of Madhya Pradesh vs. Laxmi Narayan and others, 2019(2) RCR (Criminal) 255.***

6. Heard.

7. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and the contentions of learned State counsel that the petitioners are having criminal antecedents and they have fired gun shots due to which, three persons got injured in this case; no object is to be attained by quashing the present FIR qua



the petitioners as neither the parties are relatives nor they are co-villagers and if the present petition is allowed, it will amount to rewarding a wrong doer and will give wrong signal to the society and also will give lead to such kind of activities. The power under Section 528 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 is an exceptional power and must be exercised sparingly in order to prevent the abuse of process of Court and to secure the ends of justice. The exercise of such power would not be justifiable in present case.

8. As such, this Court does not find merit in the present petition and the same stands dismissed being bereft of any merit.

February 10, 2026
manisha

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

- | | | |
|------|---------------------------|--------|
| (i) | Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| (ii) | Whether reportable | Yes/No |