

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH**

247

**Criminal Misc. No. M-20003 of 2015(O&M)  
Date of decision: October 20, 2015**

Narender Jain and others

....Petitioners

versus

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents

***CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE DAYA CHAUDHARY***

\*\*\*

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment? Yes/No
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not? Yes/No
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest? Yes/No

\*\*\*

Present: Mr. Sarfraj Hussain, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Sulinder Kumar, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Rajesh Bhateja, Advocate for respondent No.2.

\*\*\*

**DAYA CHAUDHARY, J.(Oral)**

**Crl. Misc. No.34874 of 2015**

This application has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for placing on record Annexures P-4 to P-6.

Application is allowed. Annexures P-4 to P-6 are taken on record.

**Crl. Misc. No.M-20003 of 2015**

The present petition has been filed by the petitioners, namely, Narender Jain, Deepak and Umesh Gupta under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of FIR No.683 dated 15.09.2008 registered under

Sections 51, 52A, 63, 68A of Copy Right Act, 1957 and Sections 292A and 420 IPC at Police Station Panipat City, District Panipat **Annexure P-1** and other proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise **Annexure P-2** arrived at between the parties.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that during pendency of the proceedings, a compromise was arrived at between the parties and the complainant has no objection in quashing of the FIR and other proceedings arising therefrom.

Notice of motion was issued on 02.07.2015 and the parties were directed to appear before the trial Court for recording of their statements with regard to compromise. The trial Court was also directed to send a report as to whether the compromise arrived at between the parties is genuine and without any pressure from either side or not.

In response thereto, the parties appeared before learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Panipat and accordingly, their statements were recorded. A report has been sent by the Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Panipat wherein, the factum of compromise has been affirmed. It has been mentioned therein that the dispute between the parties has been settled by way of compromise and the complainant has no objection in quashing of the FIR and other proceedings arising therefrom. The parties to the dispute have specifically stated in their respective statements that the compromise has been arrived at between them and now they do not want to proceed with the proceedings any further. It has also been mentioned therein that the compromise is as per their free will and without any pressure from either side and no other

case is pending against either of the parties. It has also been mentioned therein that no P.O. proceedings are pending against the parties.

Vide order dated 19.09.2015, learned State counsel was directed to verify as to whether any other case of similar nature or conviction is there against the parties or not.

In compliance thereto, learned State counsel, on the basis of affidavit of Deputy Superintendent of Police(City), Panipat which has been filed in the Court today, submits that no other case or conviction is there against petitioners No.2 and 3 whereas FIR No.155 dated 02.06.2003 under Sections 285, 337 IPC at Police station Prashant Vihar, Delhi is pending against petitioner No.1, namely, Narender Jain.

Since the dispute between the parties has been settled by way of compromise and the complainant has no objection in quashing of the FIR on the basis of compromise, continuation of proceedings would be a futile exercise as the complainant is not going to support the case of the prosecution and that would not only be mere wastage of the valuable time of the Court but it would also not be in the interest of both the parties.

Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and FIR No.683 dated 15.09.2008 registered under Sections 51, 52A, 63, 68A of Copy Right Act, 1957 and Sections 292A and 420 IPC at Police Station Panipat City, District Panipat as well as other proceedings arising therefrom qua petitioners, namely, Narender Jain, Deepak and Umesh Gupta are hereby quashed.

**(DAYA CHAUDHARY)**  
**JUDGE**

**October 20, 2015**

sonia g.