

RAJASTHAN HIGH COURT

सत्यमेव जयते

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN AT
JODHPUR

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous (Petition) No. 7163/2024

Shrawan Singh S/o Shri Gulab Singh, Aged About 27 Years, R/o Village Bastwa, P.s. Balesar, Dist. Jodhpur,raj.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp, Raj. High Court, Jodhpur
2. Shri Punit Tiwari S/o Shri Ramesh Dutt Tiwari, R/o 78-79, Shri Amar Shraddhya Society, Tarsal, Dist. Baroda (Gujrat), Presently Posted As General Manager, Human Resources, J.k. Lakshmi Cement And Presently R/o J.k. Puram, Pindwara, Dist. Sirohi,raj.

-----Respondents

For Petitioner(s)

:

Mr. Bhavit Sharma
Mr. Hukum Singh

For Respondent(s)

:

Mr. Lalit Kishor Sen, PP
Mr. Rahul Sharma for
Mr. Pankaj Kumar Bohra

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL BENIWAL

Order

06/05/2026

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 528 of the BNSS, 2023, for quashing of F.I.R. No.273/2024 dated 01.07.2024 registered at Police Station Pindwara, District Sirohi (Rajasthan), for the offences under Sections 333, 309(6), 310(2), 331(6), 305(a), 191(2), 191(3), 190, 115(2), 324(4), 324(5) and 140(3) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that initially the petitioner was not named in the FIR in question. He submits that the principal accused persons who were named in the FIR have

entered into a compromise with the complainant. The FIR qua co-accused Chandan Singh was quashed by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court while allowing the S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous (Petition) No. 4925/2024 vide order dated 29.07.2024.

2.1 Learned counsel further submits that in view of the said development, the present petition may also be allowed considering the compromise already arrived at between the parties and further proceedings qua the petitioner may also be quashed and aside.

3. Learned Public Prosecutor so also learned counsel for the private respondent do not oppose the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner.

4. 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 predominatingly 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."

5. In view of the compromise arrived at between the parties and applying the ratio laid down in the decision of **Gian Singh (supra)**, this Court deems it just and proper to invoke its inherent powers under Section 528 of the BNSS.

6. Accordingly, the present Criminal Miscellaneous Petition is allowed. The F.I.R. No.273/2024 dated 01.07.2024 registered at Police Station Pindwara, District Sirohi (Rajasthan), and all subsequent criminal proceedings arising therefrom against the petitioners, are hereby quashed.

7. All pending applications stand disposed of.

(SUNIL BENIWAL),J