



2025:HHC:37719

2025:HHC:37719

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

Cr.MMO No. : 1006 of 2025

Decided on : 07.11.2025

Pawan Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Himachal Pradesh & Others

...Respondents

Coram

The Hon'ble Mr. Justice Virender Singh, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting?¹

For the petitioner : Petitioner in person with Mr. Vinod K. Gupta, Advocate.

For the respondents : Mr. H.S. Rawat, Additional Advocate General with Ms. Ranjna Patial, Deputy Advocate General, assisted by SI Chandermohan, Women Police Station, Solan for respondents No.1.

Respondent No.2, in person with Mr. Sidharth, Advocate.

Virender Singh, Judge (oral).

Petitioner-Pawan Kumar has filed the present petition, under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (hereinafter referred to as 'BNSS'), for quashing of FIR No.31/2020, dated 05.09.2020 (hereinafter referred to as the FIR, in question), registered with Women Police Station, Solan, District Solan, H.P.,

¹ *Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment? Yes.*



under Sections 354 D and 506 of the Indian Penal Code (hereinafter referred to as the 'IPC'), as well as, the proceedings resultant thereto, which are stated to be pending before the Court of learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Solan, District Solan, H.P. (hereinafter referred to as the 'trial Court').

2. The relief of quashing has been sought, on the basis of the compromise, which has taken place between the petitioner and respondent No.2.

3. According to the petitioner, on the statement of respondent No.2, the FIR, in question, has been registered against him.

4. After registration of the FIR, the police has conducted the investigation and submitted the final report in the learned trial Court. When the matter was pending before the learned trial Court, the petitioner has filed the present petition for quashing of the FIR, in question.

5. According to the petitioner, during the pendency of the present petition, the matter has been compromised between him and respondent No.2.



6. The terms and conditions of the compromise have been reduced into writing, vide compromise deed Annexure P-1.

7. On the basis of the above facts, a prayer has been made that the FIR, in question, as well as, proceedings resultant thereto, pending before the learned trial Court, may kindly be quashed and set aside, by allowing the petition.

8. When put to notice, respondent No.1-State has filed the status report, mentioning therein, that respondent No.2, has made a complaint, stating therein that she is residing in a rented accommodation at Solan and the petitioner is her neighbour and serving in Army. He used to call her and chase her. She has blocked his number and due to such act of the petitioner, she has felt harassment. As such, she had lodged the FIR, in question.

9. Respondent No.2, who, at one point of time, had put the criminal machinery into motion, appeared before this Court and has deposed that due to some misunderstanding, she had lodged the FIR, in question. She has also deposed that now, she has compromised the



matter with the petitioner, voluntarily and without any pressure. She has also admitted her signature on Annexure P-1. She, in unequivocal terms, has deposed that she has no objection, in case, the petition is allowed, as prayed for.

10. Similar type of statement has also been made by the petitioner, on oath.

11. Heard.

12. In this case, the criminal machinery was put into motion, by respondent No.2, by lodging the FIR, in question, who initially had levelled the allegations against the petitioner, however, when appeared before this Court, she has exonerated the petitioner from the allegations.

13. Once, the person, who had put the criminal machinery into motion, has exonerated the petitioner from the allegations, the chances of success of prosecution case against the petitioner are not so bright.

14. When the parties, have buried all their disputes, by compromising the matter, vide compromise Annexure P-1, then, permitting the proceedings to continue



against the petitioner, would be nothing, but, abuse of process of law.

15. The primary purpose of law is to maintain peace and harmony in the society. Acceptance of the petition, would also give another opportunity to the petitioners, as well as, respondent No.2 to live peacefully in the society.

16. Even otherwise, acceptance of the compromise, by this Court, will save the precious judicial time of the learned trial Court, which, the learned trial Court will be in a position to devote for the decision of some other serious matters, pending before it.

17. Moreover, this Court is satisfied with the genuineness of the compromise Annexure P-1, entered into between the parties.

18. Considering all these facts, the petition is allowed and FIR No.31 of 2020, dated 05.09.2020, registered with Women Police Station, Solan, District Solan, H.P., under Sections 354 D and 506 of the IPC, as well as, the proceedings resultant thereto, pending before the learned trial Court, are ordered to be quashed.



2025:HHC:37719

19. The compromise deed, Annexure P-1, and the statements of the parties, recorded today, in the Court, shall form part of the judgment.

20. Pending miscellaneous applications, if any, shall also stand disposed of accordingly.

(Virender Singh)
Judge

November 07, 2025_(ps)