

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

CRM-M-39335 of 2014

Date of Decision: 19.02.2015

Dinesh and another

---Petitioners

versus

State of Haryana and another

---Respondents

Coram: Hon'ble Mrs. Justice Rekha Mittal

Present: Mr. Mohan Singla, Advocate
for Mr.Parveen Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioners

Ms. Neelam Kashyap, DAG, Haryana
for the respondent-State

Mr. Bhupinder Singh, 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. 66 dated 13.10.2014 for offence punishable under Sections 323, 506 of the Indian Penal Code (in short "IPC") registered at Police Station, Sonipat, District GRP Ambala on the basis of compromise.

The parties were directed to appear before the trial court/Illaq Magistrate on 22.12.2014 to get their statements recorded with regard to genuineness of compromise.

A report has been submitted by the Judicial Magistrate Ist

Class, Sonipat wherein it has been reported that statements of the petitioners and respondent No.2(complainant) have been recorded and statements made by the parties in the Court reveal that they have voluntarily entered into a compromise with an intention to live in peace and harmony.

Counsel for the petitioners states that only one person sustained injury and he has been arrayed as respondent No. 2.

Counsel for respondent No. 2 has conceded to the fact that the parties have settled their dispute by way of compromise and respondent No. 2 (complainant) has got no objection if the aforesaid FIR and proceedings emanating therefrom are ordered to be quashed.

Ms. Neelam Kashyap, DAG, Hayrana has put in appearance on behalf of respondent No.1. He has not disputed correctness of assertions of the petitioners and respondent No.2 (complainant) that the matter has been settled by way of compromise between the parties.

I have heard counsel for the parties and perused the case file.

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. 66 dated 13.10.2014 for offence punishable under Sections 323, 506 IPC registered at Police Station, Sonipat, District GRP

Ambala and proceedings emanating therefrom are ordered to be quashed,
qua the petitioners.

(REKHA MITTAL)
JUDGE

19.02.2015

PARAMJIT