

  
**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN AT  
JODHPUR**

S.B. Criminal Misc(Pet.) No. 2220/2026

1. Lal Singh S/o Kishan Singh, Aged About 30 Years, Resident Of Ishwal, Gogunda, District Udaipur, Raj.
2. Himmat Singh S/o Kishan Singh, Aged About 27 Years, Resident Of Ishwal, Gogunda, District Udaipur, Raj..
3. Lakhan Singh S/o Dayal Khatik, Aged About 30 Years, Resident Of Ishwal, Gogunda, District Udaipur, Raj..
4. Gopal Singh S/o Ganesh Lal Gameti, Aged About 26 Years, Resident Of Ishwal, Gogunda, District Udaipur, Raj.

----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp
2. Naresh S/o Mohan Lal, Resident Of Amjariya, Gopalpura, District Chittorgarh, Raj..

----Respondents

---

|                   |   |                                           |
|-------------------|---|-------------------------------------------|
| For Petitioner(s) | : | Mr. JVS Deora                             |
| For Respondent(s) | : | Mr. VS Rajpurohit, PP<br>Mr. Rahul Bareth |

---

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE BALJINDER SINGH SANDHU**

**Order**

**23/03/2026**

The instant criminal misc. petition has been filed by the petitioners under Section 528 BNSS, 2023 (section 482 Cr.P.C) seeking quashing of the F.I.R. No.68/2026, registered at Police Station Gogunda, District Udaipur, for offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 189(2) of BNS and under Sections 3(1)(r), 3(1)(s) and 3(2)(va) of SC/ST Prevention of Atrocities Act.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that compromise has been arrived at between the parties and the matter has been settled amicably.

Learned counsel for the respondent No.2 does not dispute the factum of compromise arrived at between the parties.

The Hon'ble Apex Court while answering a reference in the case of ***Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab & Anr.*** reported in ***JT***

**2012(9) SC – 426** has held as below:-

"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. In what cases power to quash the criminal proceeding or complaint or F.I.R may be exercised where the offender and victim have settled their dispute would depend on the facts and circumstances of each case and no category can be prescribed. However, before exercise of such power, the High Court must have due regard to the nature and gravity of the crime. Heinous and serious offences of mental depravity or offences like murder, rape, dacoity, etc. cannot be fittingly quashed even though the victim or victim's family and the offender have settled the dispute. Such offences are not private in nature and have serious impact on society. Similarly, any compromise between the victim and offender in relation to the offences under special statutes like Prevention of Corruption Act or the offences committed by public servants while working in that capacity etc; cannot provide for any basis for quashing criminal proceedings involving such offences. But the criminal cases having overwhelmingly and pre-dominantly civil flavour stand on different footing for the purposes of quashing, particularly the offences arising from commercial, financial, mercantile, civil, partnership or such like transactions or the offences arising out of matrimony relating to dowry, etc. or the family disputes where the wrong is basically private or personal in nature and the parties have resolved their entire dispute. In this category of cases, High Court may quash criminal proceedings if in its view, because of the compromise between the

offender and victim, the possibility of conviction is remote and bleak and continuation of criminal case would put accused to great oppression and prejudice and extreme injustice would be caused to him by not quashing the criminal case despite full and complete settlement and compromise with the victim. In other words, the High Court must consider whether it would be unfair or contrary to the interest of justice to continue with the criminal proceeding or continuation of the criminal proceeding would tantamount to abuse of process of law despite settlement and compromise between the victim and wrongdoer and whether to secure the ends of justice, it is appropriate that criminal case is put to an end and if the answer to the above question(s) is in affirmative, the High Court shall be well within its jurisdiction to quash the criminal proceeding."

Keeping in view the observations made by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Gian Singh's** case (supra), this Court is of the opinion that it is a fit case, wherein the criminal proceedings pending against the petitioners can be quashed while exercising powers under Section 528 BNSS.

Accordingly, the present misc. petition is allowed. The F.I.R. No.68/2026, registered at Police Station Gogunda, District Udaipur, for offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 189(2) of BNS and under Sections 3(1)(r), 3(1)(s) and 3(2)(va) of SC/ST Prevention of Atrocities Act and all other subsequent proceedings sought to be taken thereunder are hereby quashed and set aside.

All pending application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

**(BALJINDER SINGH SANDHU),J**