

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana, at Chandigarh

Criminal Misc. No. M-11813 of 2015

Date of Decision: 10.7.2015

Gulshan Verma and Others

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and Others

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Darshan Singh.

Present: Mr. Neeraj Gaur, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Rajiv Doon, Assistant Advocate
General, Haryana for respondents No.1 to 3.

Mr. Sunil Polist, Advocate
for respondent No.4.

Darshan Singh, J.

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (hereinafter referred to as "Cr.P.C.") for seeking quashing of FIR No. 510 dated 16.5.2014, registered under Sections 498-A, 506, 406 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (hereinafter referred to as "IPC") at Police Station City, Gurgaon, District Gurgaon and all the subsequent proceedings on the basis of the compromise deed dated 20.1.2015 (Annexure P2).

2. It is pertinent to mention here that in the above said case, Sudershana wife of Veerbhan Verma, mother-in-law of the complainant was also indicted as accused. However, during the pendency of the case she passed away. To support this fact, her death certificate, duly issued by the Registrar, Birth & Death, Municipal Corporation, Gurgaon, has also been placed on record.

3. Vide order dated 22.4.2015, this Court has directed the parties to get their statements recorded before the Illaqa Magistrate. The Illaqa

Magistrate was also directed to send his/her report with regard to the validity or otherwise of the compromise after recording the statements of the concerned parties.

4. In compliance of the aforesaid order, report has been received from the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Gurgaon through the learned District & Sessions Judge, Gurgaon along with the copies of the statements of the parties. In the report, it is stated that the complainant has entered into a compromise with the petitioners of her own volition and without any pressure or coercion. He further stated that the compromise is genuine, voluntary and without any coercion or undue influence.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioners contended that the parties have amicably resolved the dispute and the continuation of the proceedings will be an abuse of the process of the Court. The compromise, between the parties voluntarily and with their free will, should be given due weightage and the present proceedings should be quashed. To support his contentions, he relied upon the judgments rendered by the Hon'ble Apex Court in ***Gian Singh v. State of Punjab & Another 2012(4) R.C.R. (Criminal) 543*** and ***Shiji alias Pappu & Others v. Radhika & Another 2012(1) R.C.R. (Criminal)9 (SC)*** and also by Full Bench of this Court in ***Kulwinder Singh & Others v. State of Punjab & Another 2007(3) R.C.R. (Criminal)1052***.

6. The factum regarding compromise between the parties has also not been disputed at bar by the learned State counsel. Learned counsel for respondent No.4 has also fairly conceded that in view of the compromise effected between the parties, the complainant/victim has no objection if the impugned FIR and the consequential proceedings are quashed.

7. The petitioner has been indicted as accused for the offences punishable under Sections 498-A, 506, 406 IPC on the complaint made by respondent No.4-Sujata that her marriage was solemnized with petitioner No.1-Gulshan Verma. After the marriage, she was harassed and maltreated by her husband and his family members on account of

bringing insufficient dowry.

8. From the statements of the complainant as well as of the petitioner recorded by the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate and his report, it comes out that both the parties have voluntarily and with their free consent without any inducement, threat or promise, sorted out their dispute and have effected compromise. The copy of the compromise deed has already been placed on record as Annexure P2.

9. Taking into consideration these facts, this Court is of the opinion that the ultimate chances of conviction of the petitioners are bleak. Therefore, the pendency of FIR and continuation of the proceedings would be a sheer abuse of the process of law.

10. Thus, in view of the factum of the compromise and the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court and also the Full Bench of this Court in the cases referred to above, this petition is hereby allowed. FIR No. 510 dated 16.5.2014, registered under Sections 498-A, 506, 406 read with Section 34 IPC at Police Station City, Gurgaon, District Gurgaon and all the consequent proceedings arising therefrom are hereby quashed. If the case has already been decided by the trial Court, then this order will be of no effect.

(Darshan Singh)
Judge

July 10, 2015

“DK”