

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

**C.R.M-M No. 33628-2015
Date of Decision : 07.12.2015**

Ajmer Singh and others

..... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present : Mr. Pankaj Bali, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Surinder Singh Pannu, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. B.K.Chaudhary, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

AJAY TEWARI, J. (Oral)

Reply by way of affidavit of Anil Sharma @ Anil Kumar on behalf of respondent No.2-complainant has been filed and the same is taken on record. Copy supplied to the counsel opposite.

On 01.10.2015 the following order was passed :-

“The present petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of F.I.R. No.1035 dated 25.11.2011 registered under Sections 148, 149, 384, 120-B, 506, 420, 467, 468, 471 IPC and 25/54/59 of Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station

Karnal City, District Karnal and all other consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise effected between the parties, which is annexed as Annexure P-3 with the petition.

Notice of motion.

Ms. Tanushree Gupta, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana, at the asking of the Court, accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1.

Learned counsel for the petitioners undertakes to supply a copy of the petition to the learned Deputy Advocate General during the course of the day.

To come up on 07.12.2015.

Meanwhile, the parties are directed to be present before the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate on the date fixed i.e. 28.10.2015 or any other date convenient to the Court for recording their statements with regard to compromise. The Court is directed to record the statements of both the parties to its satisfaction to know its genuineness that the statements are not the result of any pressure or coercion in any manner. The Court is further directed to send report along with the statements of the parties with regard to validity or otherwise of the compromise effected between the parties and also intimate whether any criminal case is pending against either of the parties or not before the next date of hearing.”

Thereafter, the report of the Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Karnal dated 28.10.2015 has been received whereby he has mentioned that the parties had appeared before him and had attested to the fact that a compromise has indeed taken place between them and that the compromise has been executed voluntarily and without any pressure.

Learned Deputy Advocate General has also accepted this fact.

The Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Gian Singh v. State of Punjab and another** reported as 2012(4) RCR(Criminal) 543 has discussed in detail the inherent powers of High Court in quashing a criminal proceeding or FIR or complaint where the parties have entered into compromise except the cases which involve offences such as murder, rape dacoity etc. as such offences are not private in nature and have serious impact on society.

In view of the above judicial pronouncement, I am of the considered opinion that continuation of criminal proceedings between the parties would be an abuse of the process of law and the present compromise is for their benefit and will bring peace and harmony between them.

Consequently, this petition is allowed and the above said FIR and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom are quashed qua the petitioners.

Since the main case has been decided, the pending Criminal Misc. Application, if any, also stands disposed of.

December 07, 2015

Pooja sharma-I

**(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE**