

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH.**

CRM-M-1688 of 2015
Date of decision: 23.7.2015

Sanjeev Kumar @ Sanjiv Kumar & others ...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab & another ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJAN GUPTA

Present: Mr. Ashok Singla, Advocate for the petitioner.
Ms. Rajni Gupta, Addl. Advocate General, Punjab.
Mr. Mohit Sadana, Advocate for respondent No.2.

Rajan Gupta, J. (oral)

Petitioners have filed this petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. seeking quashing of FIR No.154 dated 22.8.2012, registered under sections 498-A, 406, 506 IPC at Police Station City Sunam, District Sangrur, on the basis of compromise.

Learned counsel for the parties submit that a compromise has been arrived at between the parties and dispute has been amicably settled. Relying upon the judgment reported as ***Kulwinder Singh and others vs. State of Punjab, 2007 (3) RCR (Crl.) 1052***, learned counsel submit that in view of compromise, the impugned FIR deserves to be quashed.

Learned State counsel does not dispute the ratio of judgment in *Kulwinder Singh's case (supra)* and submits that in case a compromise is arrived at between the parties, the State would not stand in the way of quashing of FIR.

Heard.

It appears that while issuing notice of motion a direction was issued by this court to record the statements of the parties with regard to

validity or otherwise of the compromise. A report has been received from the trial court. Operative part thereof reads thus:-

“4. Complainant Bandana Rani @ Vandana Rani and her brother Amandeep Singla, they both were duly identified in the Court by their counsel Mr. TP Bhardwaj, Advocate.

5. Thereafter, a joint statement of all the accused persons namely Sanjeev Kumar @ Sanjiv Kumar, Satpal, Suraj Bhan and Kirna Rani was recorded on 10.03.2015, wherein they stated to have compromised the matter without any pressure or coercion.

6. Thereby, from the statement of complainant Bandana Rani @ Vandana Rani and her brother Amandeep Singla, as recorded in the Court on 10.03.2015, it appears that they have compromised the matter with the above named accused persons without any pressure or coercion.

7. Statement of the parties and copy of the compromise deed are sent herewith for the kind perusal of the Hon'ble High Court.”

Compromise is in the interest of the parties and after the matter has been resolved by an amicable settlement, no useful purpose is likely to be served by continuance of the criminal proceedings. In view of the above, the present FIR and the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom deserve to be quashed in light of Full Bench judgment of this court in *Kulwinder Singh's case (supra)*.

Resultantly, the present petition is allowed. The FIR in question and the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom are quashed.

(RAJAN GUPTA)
JUDGE

23.7.2015
'Rajpal'