

**HIGH COURT OF JAMMU & KASHMIR AND LADAKH
AT JAMMU**

Case: CRM(M) No. 315/2022

Parveen Akhter and Ors.

....Petitioner(s)/Appellant(s)

Through :- Mr. Qayoom Choudhary, Advocate
V/s

U.T. of J&K & Ors.

....Respondent(s)

Through :- Mr. Sumeet Bhatia, GA
I.O. along with CD file present in person.

Coram: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SHAHZAD AZEEM, JUDGE

ORDER
17.04.2026.

01. The petitioners have invoked the jurisdiction of this Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C. seeking quashment of FIR No. 08 dated 16.02.2022 registered under Section 498-A IPC.

02. The aforesaid FIR came to be registered on the basis of allegations of harassment and cruelty allegedly meted out to respondent No. 4 (wife) by the petitioner No. 5 (husband) and in-laws. During the course of proceedings, the parties are stated to have entered into a compromise, and in this regard, a compromise deed dated 08.04.2026 has been executed and placed on record.

03. Vide order dated 10.04.2026, the parties were directed to appear before the Registrar Judicial of this Court for recording of their statements in support of the said compromise. In compliance thereof, petitioner No. 5 (husband) and respondent No. 4 (wife) appeared before the Registrar Judicial, and their statements have been recorded in support of the compromise arrived at between the parties.

04. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that as per petitioner No. 5 and respondent No. 4-complainant have resolved the dispute amicably, as such, the impugned FIR and the proceedings emanating therefrom may be quashed.

05. Mr. Sumeet Bhatia, learned GA has submitted that appropriate orders as this Court may deem fit, may be passed.

06. Heard and considered.

07. It is well settled that in the cases of disputes which have predominantly civil flavour and where the wrong is basically private or personal in nature and the parties have resolved their entire dispute, the High Court is well within its jurisdiction to quash the criminal proceedings, if it is known that because of the compromise arrived at between the parties, there is remote possibility of securing conviction of the accused. In fact, in such cases, the Supreme Court has clearly observed that it would amount to extreme injustice, if despite settlement having been arrived at by the parties, the criminal proceedings are allowed to continue.

08. Adverting to the facts of the instant case, it is clear that the parties to the dispute have entered into a compromise, whereby complainant has decided not to pursue prosecution in the impugned FIR against the petitioners. Therefore, once the rival parties have arrived at a settlement, allowing the prosecutions to continue merely because the offences alleged against the accused are non-compoundable in nature, would amount to great injustice to both the parties and, in fact, it will amount to frittering away the fruits of compromise that has been arrived at between the parties. The continuance of proceedings against the petitioners, in these circumstances, will be nothing but an abuse of process of law.

09. In view of the above, no useful purpose would be served by continuing the proceedings. Accordingly, a case for interference is made out. In the interest

of justice and considering the nature of the proceedings, FIR No. 08 dated 16.02.2022 is hereby quashed.

10. *Disposed of*, accordingly.

**(SHAHZAD AZEEM)
JUDGE**

Jammu:
17.04.2026
Mihul

