



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH**

270

CRM-M-67049-2025 (O&amp;M)

Date of decision: 23.04.2026

SWATI @ SWATI VERMA

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY**

Present : Mr. Pankaj Bali, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Amrik Narwal, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Shivam Kaushik, Advocate for respondent Nos.2 and 3.

\*\*\*\*\*

**AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (Oral)**

1. The present petition has been filed for quashing of FIR No.37, dated 22.01.2022, registered under Sections 66(C) of Information Technology (Amendment) Act, 2008 ( Section 67(A) IT Act has deleted) Sections 201, 506 IPC, at Police Station Mullan, Ambala and charge order dated 11.03.2024, and all other consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of the compromise dated 06.11.2025 (Annexure P-3).

2. This Court while issuing notice of motion vide order dated 01.12.2025, directed the parties to appear before the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate for recording their statements with regard to the compromise.

3. Pursuant to the aforesaid order, report dated 09.04.2026 has been received from the Ld. ACJM, Ambala. A perusal of the said report reveals that statements of the concerned persons have been recorded in the present case, who have stated that the matter has been settled between them and they have no objection in case the FIR in question is quashed. The compromise effected between them is genuine, without any undue influence and coercion. It is stated in the report that there is one accused. None of the accused has been declared as proclaimed offender and is not involved in any other FIR.

4. Heard learned counsel for the parties and also gone through the case file.

5. The Full Bench of this Court in **Kulwinder Singh and others vs. State of Punjab**, 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052, held that High Court has power under Section 482 Cr.P.C. to allow the compounding of non-compoundable



offence and quash the prosecution where the High Court is of the view that the same was required to prevent the abuse of the process of law or otherwise to secure the ends of justice. This power of quashing is not confined to matrimonial disputes alone.

6. Hon'ble the Supreme Court of India in the case of **Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab and another**, 2012 (4) RCR (Criminal) 543, had observed that in order to secure the ends of justice or to prevent the abuse of process of Court, inherent power can be used by this Court to quash criminal proceedings in which a compromise has been effected. The relevant portion of para 57 of the said judgment reads thus:-

“57. The position that emerges from the above discussion can be summarised thus: the power of the High Court in quashing a criminal proceeding or FIR or complaint in exercise of its inherent jurisdiction is distinct and different from the power given to a criminal court for compounding the offences under Section 320 of the Code.

Inherent power is of wide plenitude with no statutory limitation but it has to be exercised in accord with the guideline engrafted in such power viz; (i) to secure the ends of justice or (ii) to prevent abuse of the process of any Court. XXX---XXX”

7. In view of the afore-referred judgments, perusing the report of the trial Court regarding amicable settlement between the petitioner and the complainant, this Court finds that quashing the FIR will accord a quietus to all disputes between the parties and it is in the interest of both sides to bury the hatchet and lead a peaceful life. Thus, no useful purpose would be served in continuing the proceedings and in order to secure the ends of justice, the criminal proceedings in the present case deserve to be quashed.

8. Resultantly, the present petition is allowed and FIR No.37, dated 22.01.2022, registered under Sections 66(C) of Information Technology (Amendment) Act, 2008 ( Section 67(A) IT Act has deleted) Sections 201, 506 IPC, at Police Station Mullan, Ambala and charge order dated 11.03.2024, and all other consequential proceedings arising therefrom are quashed qua the petitioners on the basis of the compromise dated 06.11.2025.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)  
JUDGE

23.04.2026

ashok

|                           |   |        |
|---------------------------|---|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | : | Yes/No |
| Whether reportable        | : | Yes/No |