



2026:CGHC:14915-DB

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

CRMP No. 900 of 2026

1 - Neeraj Dilip Jain S/o Shri Dilip Jain, Aged About 37 Years, R/o E-92 Mahatma Ghandhi Chowk, Kranti Nagar, Akruli Road, Kandivali East, Mumbai- 400101

2 - Suyog Sadashiv Patil S/o Shri Sadashiv Patil, Aged About 33 Years, R/o 103, Vrundavan Park, Aachole Cross Road, Nallasopara, East Palghar (MH)

... Petitioners

versus

1 - State of Chhattisgarh Through The Station House Officer, Police Station Civil Lines, Bilaspur District Bilaspur (C.G.)

2 - Smt. Renuka Chouhan W/o Shri Vinod Chouhan, Aged About 62 Years, R/o Ward No. 46, Bangalipara, Naya Sarkhanda, Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

... Respondents

(Cause-title taken from Case Information System)

For Petitioners : Mr. Manay Nath Thakur, Advocate.

For State : Mr. Priyank Rathi, Govt. Advocate.

For Respondent No.2 : Mr. Abhinav Sharma, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

Hon'ble Shri Ravindra Kumar Agrawal, Judge

Order on Board

Per Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

01-04-2026

1. Heard Mr. Manay Nath Thakur, learned counsel for the petitioners. Also heard Mr. Priyank Rathi, learned Govt. Advocate, appearing for the respondent No.1/State and Mr. Abhinav Sharma, learned counsel appearing for respondent No.2.

2. The present petition under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023 has been filed by the petitioners with the following prayer:-

“It is, therefore, prayed that this Hon’ble Court may be pleased to pass an order compounding in light of the agreement executed between the petitioners and respondent no.2 in facts and circumstances of the case and further be please to quash Case No.390/2021 pending before JMFC Bilaspur and FIR / Crime no. 32/2017 registered with Police station civil lines, Bilaspur (CG) under section 420 r/w34 of the IPC in facts and circumstance of the case, in the interest of justice.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the matter has been compromised between the petitioners and respondent No.2/complainant vide settlement agreement/compromise deed dated 06-03-2026.

4. Learned counsel for respondent No.2/complainant does not dispute the fact of compromise and has stated that the original compromise deed is with the complainant.

5. Considering the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties and the fact that the matter is of the year 2017 and the

proceedings are pending before the learned Magistrate since the year 2021, it would be more appropriate that the parties should appear before the learned trial Court concerned and file appropriate application along with the original compromise deed before it who after due verification shall pass appropriate orders on the application moved by the parties. In view of the above, we are not inclined to interfere in the matter. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.

Sd/-

(Ravindra Kumar Agrawal)
Judge

Sd/-

(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice