

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA**

**Cr. MMO No. 927 of 2025**

**Reserved on: 3.3.2026**

**Date of Decision: 12.3.2026.**

---

Nandan Sharma .....Petitioner

Versus

State of HP & ors. .... Respondents

---

*Coram*

***Hon'ble Mr Justice Rakesh Kainthla, Judge.***

***Whether approved for reporting?<sup>1</sup> No***

For the Petitioner : Mr Rocky, Advocate.

For Respondents No.1 & 2 : Mr Ajit Sharma, Deputy  
Advocate General.

For Respondents No.3 to 6 : Mr Peeyush Agnihotri,  
Advocate.

---

***Rakesh Kainthla, Judge***

The petitioner has filed the present petition for quashing of FIR No. 38 of 2023, dated 9.3.2023, registered at Police Station Jawalamukhi, District Kangra, H.P., for the commission of offences punishable under Sections 279, 337 and 338 of the Indian Penal Code (IPC), and consequential

---

<sup>1</sup> Whether reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgment? Yes.

proceedings arising out of the said FIR based on the compromise effected between the parties.

2. It has been asserted that the parties have settled their disputes with the intervention of the elders and respectable persons of the society. They want to maintain cordial relations with each other and do not want to proceed further with the matter. Hence the petition.

3. Separate statements of informant-Vyas Dev, injured Raj Kumar, Navya and Kritika were recorded on 9.10.2025, in which they stated that they had settled the matter voluntarily without any influence from any person. Statements of Rajeev Kumar (father of Kritika) and Inder Singh (father of Navya) were recorded on 1.1.2026, in which they stated that Kritika and Navya were minors and they had entered into a compromise on their behalf. They had no objection if the FIR was ordered to be quashed based on the compromise effected between the parties.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the records carefully.

5. Section 320(4)(a) of Cr.P.C. provides that when the person who would otherwise be competent to compound an

offence is under 18 years, any person competent to contract on his behalf may, with the permission of the Court, compound the offence. The offences punishable under Sections 337 and 338 of the IPC are compoundable with the permission of the Court. Since the matter has been settled on behalf of the minors by their respective fathers, who are the best persons to safeguard the interests of the minors, hence the necessary permission is granted, and the offences punishable under Sections 337 and 338 of the IPC are permitted to be compounded.

6. The FIR has been registered for the commission of offences punishable under Sections 279, 337 and 338 of the IPC. This Court has already quashed the F.I.R. registered for the commission of offences punishable under Sections 279, 337, and 338 of IPC in *Sushant vs State of H.P. 2023 HLJ 531*, *Vikas Huda vs. State of H.P. 2023 STPL 3009*, *Kulwidner Singh vs Ankush Kumar 2023 HLR 384* and *Nishant vs. State 2022 Suppl. Law Cases 45* based on compromise. These judgments are binding on this Court.

7. In view of these binding precedents, the present petition is allowed and the FIR No. 38 of 2023, dated 9.3.2023, registered at Police Station Jawalamukhi, District Kangra, H.P.,

for the commission of offences punishable under Sections 279, 337 and 338 of IPC is ordered to be quashed. Consequent upon the quashing of FIR, criminal proceedings pending/initiated against the petitioner-accused in pursuance thereto are also ordered to be quashed.

8. Petition stands disposed of in the above terms, so also pending miscellaneous applications, if any.

9. Parties are permitted to produce a copy of this judgment, downloaded from the webpage of the High Court of Himachal Pradesh, before the authorities concerned, and the said authorities shall not insist on the production of a certified copy, but if required, may verify passing of the order from the Website of the High Court.

**(Rakesh Kainthla)**  
**Judge**

12<sup>th</sup> March, 2026  
(Chander)