

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

**CRM-M-37050 of 2014
Date of Decision: 05.02.2015**

Hari Ram and another

---Petitioners

versus

State of Punjab and another

---Respondents

Coram: Hon'ble Mrs. Justice Rekha Mittal

**Present: Mr.Rajesh Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioners**

**Mr. P.S.Madahar, AAG, Punjab
for the respondent-State**

**Mr.Viney Puri, Advocate
for respondent No.2**

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

REKHA MITTAL, J.

The petitioners have prayed for quashing of FIR No. 30 dated 23.4.2012 for offence punishable under Sections 354, 323, 506 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code (in short "IPC") registered at Police Station, Meharban, District Ludhiana on the basis of compromise (Annexures P-2).

In the instant case, the FIR was registered on the statement of respondent No.2-complainant Poonam. Now the matter has been amicably settled between the parties.

Respondent No.2-complainant is present in Court with her counsel Mr. Viney Puri, Advocate. Affidavit of respondent No.2 filed in Court is taken on record. Her statement was recorded in the Court. An extract from her statement is quoted thus:-

“FIR No. 30 dated 23.4.2012 for offence punishable under Sections 354, 323, 506 read with Section 34 IPC at Police Station, Meharban, District Ludhiana was registered on my statement against my mother-in-law and father-in-law. The dispute has been settled by way of compromise and at present, I am staying at my in-laws house. I have filed my short reply by way of affidavit in the Court which may be read as part of my statement. I have got no objection if the aforesaid FIR and proceeding emanating therefrom are ordered to be quashed.”

Counsel for the petitioners submits that as the parties have amicably settled their differences, no useful purpose would be served by continuation of the criminal proceedings.

Mr. P.S.Madhar, AG, Punjab and Mr. Viney Puri, Advocate, counsel for respondent No. 2 have not disputed contention of the petitioners that the parties have arrived at an amicable settlement.

I have heard counsel for the parties and perused the records.

There is nothing on record to doubt correctness of the compromise effected between the parties, whereby they have decided to settle their dispute with an intention to live in peace and harmony. The present case falls in the category of cases, which can be allowed to be settled by way of compromise, in view of the decision of Hon'ble the

Supreme Court of India in *Gian Singh v. State of Punjab and another, 2012(4) R.C.R. (Criminal) 543.*

In view of what has been discussed hereinabove, the petition is allowed and FIR No. 30 dated 23.4.2012 for offence punishable under Sections 354, 323, 506 read with Section 34 IPC registered at Police Station, Meharban, District Ludhiana and proceedings emanating therefrom are ordered to be quashed, qua the petitioners.

(REKHA MITTAL)
JUDGE

05.02.2015

PARAMJIT