

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

**CRM-M-12047-2017
Date of decision: 30.08.2017**

Tarun Arora

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana & Another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present:- Mr. Abhilaksh Grover, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Gaganpreet Kaur, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Rajesh Kapila, Advocate,
for respondent No. 2.

JAISHREE THAKUR, J. (Oral)

This petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure seeking quashing of FIR No. 230 dated 04.05.2016, under Sections 406, 498-A and 506 of the IPC, registered at Police Station SGM Nagar, District Faridabad and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom in view of the mutual settlement/compromise dated 30.01.2017 (Annexure P-3) entered into between the parties.

The marriage of respondent No. 2 was solemnized on 19.04.2015 with petitioner Tarun Arora as per Hindu rites and rituals. However, due to temperamental differences between the husband and wife, matrimonial dispute arose and the aforesaid FIR has been registered on the statement of complainant/respondent No. 2-Upasna Arora. Now with the intervention of respectable persons, the matrimonial dispute has been amicably settled between the parties and they have entered into a

compromise. In fact, a petition under Section 13-B of the Hindu Marriage Act has also been filed for dissolution of the marriage.

Keeping in view the fact that the parties have entered into a compromise, they were directed to appear before the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate for getting their statements recorded in support of the compromise. In pursuance of the direction, a report has been received from JMIC, Faridabad, stating that the compromise arrived at between the parties is without any pressure or coercion from any one and the same appears to be genuine one.

Learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab, on instructions from the Investigating Officer admits to the factum of compromise and submits that in case the parties have indeed settled their dispute, the State would have no objection to the quashing of the FIR, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. Learned counsel for respondent No. 2 further submits that in fact the second motion proceedings, initiated under Section 13-B of the Hindu Marriage Act, has completed and the parties have parted their ways.

I have heard learned counsel for the rival parties and gone through the record.

In a decision, based on compromise, none of the parties is a loser. Rather, a compromise not only brings peace and harmony between the parties to a dispute, but also restores tranquility in the society. After considering the nature of offences allegedly committed and the fact that both the parties have amicably settled their dispute, continuance of criminal prosecution would be an exercise in futility, as the chances of ultimate

conviction are bleak.

Consequently, keeping in view the fact that the dispute has been amicably settled and in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Narinder Singh & others vs. State of Punjab & another, (2014) 6 SCC 466*, this petition is allowed and FIR No. 230 dated 04.05.2016, under Sections 406, 498-A and 506 of the IPC, registered at Police Station SGM Nagar, District Faridabad and all subsequent proceedings arising out of the same are quashed qua the petitioners.

The petition stands disposed of.

August 30, 2017
Ansari

(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No