

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

CRM-M-6719 of 2016
Date of decision: 12.05.2016

Vineet Sandhu

----Petitioner (s)

V/s

**Union Territory of Chandigarh
& another**

-----Respondent(s)

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARI PAL VERMA

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

Present:- Mr. Sukhwinder Singh Nara, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Ashima Mor, AAP for U.T. Chandigarh.

Mr. Ajey Bishnoi, Advocate for
Mr. M.S. Sindhu, Advocate for respondent No. 2.

HARI PAL VERMA, J.(Oral)

Prayer in this petition is for quashing of FIR No.11 dated 17.1.2014 under Sections 384 and 506 IPC registered at Police Station Sector-19, Chandigarh and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise (Annexure P-2).

This Court vide order dated 25.02.2016 had directed the parties to appear before the trial Court to get their statements recorded with regard to compromise and the trial Court was directed to submit its report qua the genuineness of the compromise.

Pursuant to the aforesaid order dated 25.02.2016, the parties have appeared before learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class,

Chandigarh and got their statements recorded. On the basis of the statements so recorded, learned Magistrate has forwarded his report dated 18.03.2016 to the effect that the parties have willfully settled their differences and reached at a bona fide compromise without any pressure and the same is genuine.

The statement suffered by respondent No.2/complainant, namely, Kalyani Verma in support of the compromise before learned Magistrate on 15.03.2016, reads as under:-

"I am complainant in FIR No.11 dated 17.11.2014 under Section 384/506 of IPC registered at P.S. 19, Chandigarh. Now I have compromised the matter with the accused with the intervention of respectables vide compromise deed Ex.PA. I admit my signatures on the same and the compromise has been effected with the accused with my sweet will and without any pressure or coercion. In pursuance to terms and conditions of compromise deed, I have no objection if the aforementioned FIR is quashed. I tender self attested copy of my Adhar card as my identity proof."

Apart from the above statement of complainant-respondent No.2, whereby she has shown no objection to the FIR being quashed, there is nothing on record to doubt the genuineness of the compromise, as arrived between the parties. Thus, no useful purpose would be served to continue with the proceedings in the instant FIR.

Learned APP appearing for U.T. Chandigarh as well as learned counsel appearing for respondent No.2-complainant does not dispute the factum of compromise entered into between the parties.

Accordingly, following the principles laid down by the Full Bench judgment of this Court in **Kulwinder Singh and others v.**

State of Punjab and another, 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052 (P&H),

as approved by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab and others, (2012)10 SCC 303**, this petition is allowed and FIR No.11 dated 17.1.2014 under Sections 384 and 506 IPC registered at Police Station Sector-19, Chandigarh and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, are quashed, qua the petitioner, in view of the compromise (Annexure P-2).

12.05.2016

Anjal

**[HARI PAL VERMA]
JUDGE**