



2025:HHC:40361

2025:HHC:40361

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

Cr.MMO No. 1054 of 2025

Decided on : 27.11.2025

Pradeep Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of H.P. & Anr.

...Respondents

Coram

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

Whether approved for reporting?¹

For the petitioner : Petitioner in person, with Ms. Kiran Lata Negi, Advocate.

For the respondents : Mr. H.S. Rawat, Additional Advocate General, for respondent No.1/State.

Respondent No. 2 in person with Ms. Pooja Thakur, Advocate.

Virender Singh, Judge

Petitioner Pradeep Kumar has approached this Court, under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (hereinafter referred to as 'BNSS'), for quashing of FIR No. 16 of 2022 dated 07.01.2022, under Sections 452, 354-D, 355, 506 of Indian Penal Code,

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



(hereinafter referred to as “FIR in question”) registered with Police Station Balh, District Mandi, H.P., as well as, the proceedings resultant thereto, which are pending in the Court of learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Court No. 1 Mandi, District Mandi, H.P. (hereinafter referred to as “the learned trial Court”), on the basis of the compromise, which is stated to have taken place between the petitioner and respondent No. 2.

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

3. After registration of the FIR, the police has conducted the investigation and submitted charge sheet before 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.

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



5. The terms and conditions of the compromise have been reduced into writing, vide compromise deed Annexure P-2.

6. 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.

7. 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 petitioner Pradeep Kumar, whose mobile phone number is 80910-57499, has been harassing her over the phone for a long time. She is currently living with her son, in a rented house with her father. On 06.01.2022, at around 10:00 am, when her father had gone to work, petitioner Pradeep Kumar came inside the house, grabbed her by her arm, saying that today he will take her and if she refuse, he will kill her. She screamed loudly and her uncle, came and tried to rescue her from petitioner Pradeep Kumar, but Pradeep Kumar (petitioner) assaulted her. She requested



to take strict action against the petitioner Pradeep Kumar. As such, she had lodged the FIR, in question.

8. 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 had solemnized the marriage with petitioner Pradeep Kumar, on 19.05.2022, and they have been blessed with a daughter and presently residing happily with the petitioner in the matrimonial house. She has compromised the matter with the petitioner, voluntarily and without any pressure. She has also admitted her signatures on Annexure P-2. She, in unequivocal terms, has deposed that she has no objection, in case, the petition is allowed, as prayed for.

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

10. Heard.

11. 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, levelled by her in the FIR, in question.

12. 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.

13. When the parties, have buried all their disputes, by compromising the matter, vide compromise Annexure P-2, then, permitting the proceedings to continue against the petitioner, would be nothing, but abuse of process of law.

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

15. 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.

16. Moreover, this Court is satisfied with the genuineness of the compromise Annexure P-2, entered into between the parties.

17. Considering all these facts, the petition is allowed. FIR No. 16/2022 dated 07.01.2022, under Sections 452, 354-D, 355, 506 IPC, registered with Police Station Balh, District Mandi, H.P., as well as, proceedings resultant thereto, pending in the learned trial Court, are ordered to be quashed.

18. The compromise deed, Annexure P-2, as well as, statements of the parties, recorded today, in the Court, shall form part of this order.

19. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(Virender Singh)
Judge

27th November, 2025
(Pramod)