

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

CRM-M No.16980 of 2017

Date of Decision: 13.07.2017

Karuna Sharma @ Pooja

. . . Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

. . . Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present: Mr. Ajay Dhankar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. P.P. Chahar, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Rajesh Gupta, Advocate
for respondent Nos.2 to 5.

Jaishree Thakur, J. (Oral)

This petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure seeking quashing of FIR No. 13 dated 05.01.2017 (Annexure P-1), registered under Sections 406, 498-A and 506 of the IPC at Police Station Sampla, District Rohtak and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom in view of the compromise (Annexure P-2) entered into between the parties.

In brief, the facts of the case are that the marriage of respondent No.2 was solemnized on 24.02.2012 with the petitioner and ceremonies at Sampla. However, due to temperamental differences

CRM-M No.16980 of 2017

between the husband and wife, matrimonial dispute arose and the aforesaid FIR has been registered on the statement of complainant/petitioner-Karuna Sharma @ Pooja. Now with the intervention of respectable persons, the matrimonial dispute has been amicably settled between the parties and they have entered into a compromise. Now with the intervention of respectable persons, the matter has been amicably compromised between the parties and they have resolved their disputes and differences.

Keeping in view the fact that the parties have entered into a compromise, they were directed to appear before the Illaqa Magistrate for getting their statements recorded in support of the compromise. In pursuance of the direction, a report dated 03.07.2017, has been received from the Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Rohtak stating that the compromise arrived at between the parties is without any pressure or coercion or undue influence from any one and the same appears to be genuine one. It is also reported that no other case is pending between the parties.

Learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab, on instructions from the Investigating Officer admits the factum of compromise and submit that in case the parties have indeed settled their dispute, they would have no objection to the quashing of the FIR, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

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

CRM-M No.16980 of 2017

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 Gian Singh Versus State of Punjab and another, 2012 (4) RCR (Cr.) 543, this petition is allowed and FIR No. 13 dated 05.01.2017 (Annexure P-1), registered under Sections 406, 498-A and 506 of the IPC at Police Station Sampla, District Rohtak and all subsequent proceedings arising out of the same are quashed qua the petitioners.

The petition stands disposed of.

[JAISHREE THAKUR]
JUDGE

13.07.2017
sachin

Whether Speaking/reasoned	:	Yes
Whether Reportable	:	No