

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

**Criminal Misc. No. M-26708 of 2015  
Date of decision: 11.05.2016**

Sushil Sabharwal and others

..Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another

..Respondents

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

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

**Present:** Mr. N.L. Sammi, Advocate  
for the petitioners.

Mr. Rupam Aggarwal, DAG, Punjab  
for respondent No.1 – State.

None for respondent No.2.

**Daya Chaudhary, J.**

Petitioners, namely, Sushil Sabharwal, Baljit Kaur and Anil Sabharwal, have approached this Court by way of filing the present petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of FIR No.116 dated 10.06.2015 registered under Sections 494, 497, 498-A, 503, 506 and 420 of Indian Penal Code (for short 'IPC') at Police Station City Rajpura, District Patiala on the basis of compromise arrived at between the parties.

The aforesaid FIR was registered on the basis of complaint made by respondent No.2. During pendency of the

proceedings, a compromise was arrived at between the parties with the intervention of respectables. Petitioner No.1 is husband of the complainant and petitioner No.3 is elder brother of petitioner No.1 whereas petitioner No.2 is not in relation of respondent No.2.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the aforesaid FIR was registered due to misunderstanding between the parties and now the misunderstanding has been removed. Petitioner No.1 and respondent No.2 are residing together and respondent No.2 has no objection in quashing of the FIR and other proceedings.

Learned counsel for respondent No.2 has not disputed the factum of compromise arrived at between the parties.

Heard arguments of learned counsel for the parties and have also perused the allegations levelled in the FIR; compromise arrived at between the parties and the statements of the parties recorded in compliance of directions issued by this Court on 12.08.2015.

In response to the directions issued by this Court on 12.08.2015, the parties appeared before Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Rajpura and their statements with regard to compromise were recorded. A report along with the statements of the parties has been sent, which is on record wherein the factum of compromise has been affirmed. It has also been mentioned in the report that the compromise arrived at between the parties is as per their free will. Complainant-respondent No.2 has specifically stated in her statement

that she is residing with her husband and is happy in her matrimonial life. She has also stated that she has no objection in quashing of the FIR and other proceedings.

The dispute between the parties is matrimonial in nature and the same has been settled by way of compromise as the misunderstanding between the parties has been removed. Both the parties are residing together. Complainant-respondent No.2 has no objection in quashing of the FIR and other proceedings. Moreover, no purpose would be served in case proceedings are allowed to be continued in future as it would result into wastage of precious time of the Court.

Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the impugned criminal proceedings arising out of FIR No.116 dated 10.06.2015 registered under Sections 494, 497, 498-A, 503, 506 and 420 IPC at Police Station City Rajpura, District Patiala as well as all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom qua petitioners, namely, Sushil Sabharwal, Baljit Kaur and Anil Sabharwal, are hereby quashed.

11.05.2016  
neetu

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