HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous (Petition) No. 3328/2026
CNR: RJHC020481172026 | URN: CRLMP / 7468U / 2026

Lalit Kumar Son Of Shri Devilal, Resident Of Hingoniya, Police Station Kanota, District Jaipur (Raj.)

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through P.p.
2. Mangal Chand Kumawat Son Of Shri Roopa Ram, Resident Of Hirnoda, Police Station Phulera, District Jaipur Rural (Raj.)

----Respondents

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Abhishek Gotecha
For Respondent(s)	:	Ms. Arti Sharma, PP

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR UPMAN

Order

20/08/2026

1. By way of this Criminal Misc. Petition under Section 528 of the B.N.S.S., the accused-petitioner has assailed the order dated 05.03.2025 passed by learned Additional Senior Civil Judge & Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate No.7, Jaipur Metropolitan I (Raj.) in Criminal Case No.55/2025 arising out of FIR No.278/2008 registered at Police Station Shyam Nagar, Jaipur City (South) whereby learned trial Court attested the compromise to the extent of offence punishable under Sections 419 & 420 IPC and acquitted the petitioner from the said offence, but declined to attest the compromise for offences under Sections 467, 468, 471 & 120B IPC.

2. After registration of the aforesaid FIR, the police conducted investigation in the matter and submitted charge-sheet before the

concerned Court for offences punishable under Sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of IPC.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that during the pendency of the criminal proceedings, dispute has been resolved by the parties amicably in the spirit of Lok Adalat. Counsel submits that both the parties filed a joint compromise application before the trial Court for compounding the offences punishable under Sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of IPC. The learned trial Court vide order dated 05.03.2025, partly allowed the application and accepted the compromise only to the extent of offence punishable under Sections 419 & 420 IPC and acquitted the petitioner from the said offence, but declined to attest/accept the compromise for offences punishable under Sections 467, 468, 471 & 120B IPC. Counsel submits that on account of compromise, further proceedings in the matter are fruitless and continuation thereof would be a futile exercise and a waste of precious judicial time and resources. Therefore, order dated 05.03.2025 may be modified and proceedings pending against the petitioner for offence punishable under Sections 467, 468, 471 & 120B IPC may be quashed in view of compromise arrived at between the parties.

4. Learned Public Prosecutor and learned counsel for the complainant do not dispute the factum of compromise. Learned counsel for the complainant submits that complainant has no objection if the criminal proceedings pending against the petitioner before the learned trial Court are quashed on the basis of compromise arrived at between the parties.

5. In view of the aforesaid and considering the submissions made on behalf of the parties; the material made available for perusal of this Court; considering the fact that petitioner and complainant have arrived at compromise and settled their dispute amicably and also finding that the present case is wholly covered by the principle of law laid down by Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Gian Singh versus State of Punjab & Anr.*** *reported in* ***2012 Cr.L.J. (SC) 4934*** and in the case of ***State of Haryana & Ors. versus Choudhary Bhajan Lal & Ors.*** *reported in* ***AIR 1992 SC 604***, the criminal proceedings in Criminal Case No.55/2025 pending before the learned trial Court for offences punishable under Sections 467, 468, 471 & 120B IPC are liable to be quashed in view of compromise arrived at between the parties although the said offences alleged to be made out in the instant case are not compoundable.

6. In view of the above, this Criminal Misc. Petition is allowed and the proceedings in Criminal Case No.55/2025 pending before the learned Additional Senior Civil Judge & Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate No.7, Jaipur Metropolitan I (Raj.) for offences punishable under Sections 467, 468, 471 & 120B IPC, against the petitioner are quashed in view of compromise arrived at between the parties. Consequence to follow.

7. The stay application and pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(ANIL KUMAR UPMAN),J

36/Dushyant