

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

S.B. Criminal Misc(Pet.) No. 9977/2025

1. Suja Ram, Aged About 75 Years, R/o Lolava, Gudamalani, Barmer
2. Thakra Ram S/o Karna Ram, Aged About 40 Years, R/o Lolava, Gudamalani, Barmer
3. Joga Ram S/o Karna Ram, Aged About 38 Years, R/o Lolava, Gudamalani, Barmer
4. Bhoma Ram S/o Girdhari Ram, Aged About 32 Years, R/o Lolava, Gudamalani, Barmer
5. Bhagwana Ram S/o Rama Ram, Aged About 40 Years, R/o Lolava, Gudamalani, Barmer
6. Bhera Ram Alias Shankar S/o Padma Ram, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Lolava, Gudamalani, Barmer
7. Shankar S/o Karna Ram, Aged About 34 Years, R/o Lolava, Gudamalani, Barmer
8. Padma Ram S/o Chimna Ram, Aged About 59 Years, R/o Lolava, Gudamalani, Barmer
9. Dalu Ram S/o Padma Ram, Aged About 26 Years, R/o Lolava, Gudamalani, Barmer
10. Uka Ram S/o Padma Ram, Aged About 19 Years, R/o Lolava, Gudamalani, Barmer
11. Vana Ram S/o Padma Ram, Aged About 42 Years, R/o Lolava, Gudamalani, Barmer

----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Public Prosecutor.
2. Mada Kumari D/o Mula Ram, Aged About 20 Years, R/o Jiwana,sayla, District Jalore.

----Respondents

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Mukesh Trivedi
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. V.S. Rajpurohit, PP Mr. Prakash Chand Sharma

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE BALJINDER SINGH SANDHU
Order

12/03/2026

The instant criminal misc. petition under Section 528 of BNSS has been filed by the petitioner seeking quashing of the FIR No.240/2025, registered at Police Station Sayla, District Jalore, for the offence under Sections 115(2), 331(2), 109(1) and 189(2) of the BNS.

Learned counsel for the parties submitted that the parties have settled their disputes and have arrived at a compromise.

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."

He, therefore, prayed that the impugned criminal proceedings may kindly be quashed.

Learned counsel for the complainant concurs with the factum of compromise and submits that in view of the compromise, the complainant is not inclined to further prosecute the petitioner.

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.

Accordingly, the present Criminal Miscellaneous Petition is allowed. The FIR No. 240/2025 registered at Police Station Sayla, District Jalore, for the offences under Sections 115(2), 331(2), 109(1) and 189(2) of the BNS, and all subsequent criminal proceedings arising therefrom against the petitioner, are hereby quashed.

(BALJINDER SINGH SANDHU),J