

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JAMMU & KASHMIR AND LADAKH
AT SRINAGAR**

**CRM(M) 599/2024
CrLM(1386/2024)**

ABDUL ROUF DAR

...Petitioner/Appellant(s)

Through: None

Vs.

**UNION TERRITORY THROUGH
POLICE STATION BATAMALOO AND
ANR.**

...Respondent(s)

Through: None

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY PARIHAR, JUDGE

ORDER

17.04.2026

1. Nemo for parties.
2. The petitioner, by way of the present petition, seeks quashing of FIR No. 192/2017 registered for offences under Sections 323, 354 and 506 RPC, primarily on the ground that the same emanates from a matrimonial dispute which now stands amicably resolved between the parties.
3. In compliance with the directions of this Court, the parties appeared before the Registrar Judicial and their statements were recorded on oath. Respondent No. 2 (complainant) stated that the FIR in question was lodged due to matrimonial discord; however, with the intervention of respectable persons, the parties have settled their disputes vide compromise dated 15.04.2024 and have resumed

matrimonial relations. She further stated that she has no objection to the quashing of the FIR. The petitioner also corroborated the said position.

4. It is pertinent to note that offences under Sections 323 and 506 RPC are compoundable in terms of Section 320 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, whereas the offence under Section 354 RPC is non-compoundable. However, the law is well-settled that this Court, in exercise of its inherent jurisdiction, can quash criminal proceedings even in respect of non-compoundable offences where the dispute is essentially private in nature and continuation of proceedings would amount to abuse of process of law.
5. In *Gian Singh v. State of Punjab, 2012 10 SCC 303*, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that criminal proceedings involving offences of a personal and private nature, particularly arising out of matrimonial disputes, can be quashed if the parties have amicably settled the matter. This principle was further elaborated in *Narinder Singh v. State of Punjab, 2014 6 SCC 466*, wherein it was observed that the High Court must consider whether the possibility of conviction is remote and whether continuation of proceedings would serve any useful purpose.
6. In the present case, the parties have not only entered into a compromise but have also resumed cohabitation. The complainant has categorically stated that she does not wish to pursue the matter. In such circumstances, the possibility of conviction is bleak and

continuation of proceedings would only result in unnecessary harassment and abuse of the process of law.

7. Accordingly, this Court is of the considered opinion that it is a fit case for exercise of inherent powers under Section 482 CrPC to secure the ends of justice.
8. Consequently, the petition is allowed and FIR No. 192/2017 registered under Sections 323, 354 and 506 RPC, along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, is hereby quashed.
9. *Disposed of* accordingly.

SRINAGAR:
17.04.2026
Akshil Dev



(SANJAY PARIHAR)
JUDGE