

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

-.-

Crl. Misc. M 26757 of 2016

Date of decision: 27.01.2017

Manish Bansal and others

..... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

..... Respondents

Coram: Hon'ble Mrs. Justice Rekha Mittal

-.-

Present: Mr. Sunil K Sahore, Advocate
 for the petitioners
 Mr. Amrik Narwal, DAG, Haryana
 Mr. Sanjay Pathania, Advocate
 for respondent No. 2

-.-

Rekha Mittal, J.

Through the present petition filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (in short, 'Cr.P.C.'), the petitioners have prayed for quashing of FIR No. 264 dated 13.12.2013 for offence punishable under Sections 406, 498-A and 506 of the Indian Penal Code (in short, 'IPC') registered with Police Station Sector 14, Panchkula and proceedings emanating therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 09.07.2016 (Annexure P-2) arrived at between the parties.

Counsel for the petitioners states that petitioner No. 1 and respondent No. 2 have mutually resolved their personal differences vide compromise deed dated 09.07.2016.

Vide order dated 05.12.2016, the parties were directed to appear before the trial Court to get their statements recorded with regard to genuineness of compromise.

Pursuant thereto, a report has been submitted by the Chief

Judicial Magistrate, Panchkula wherein it has been reported that statements

of the parties have been recorded and they have voluntarily compromised the matter.

Counsel for the State does not dispute genuineness of the compromise in view of the report of trial Court.

Counsel for respondent No. 2 submits that he has no objection if the said FIR and proceedings emanating therefrom are quashed.

A perusal of allegations in the FIR reveals that the present case squarely falls in that category of cases which can be quashed by the High Court, in exercise of its inherent power under Section 482 Cr.P.C. Keeping in view the authoritative enunciation of law laid down by Hon'ble the Supreme Court in '*Gian Singh v. State of Punjab and another*', 2012(4) R.C.R. (Criminal) 543 and in the light of facts and circumstances of the present case, this Court is of the considered opinion that continuation of criminal proceedings would amount to abuse of process of law and it is expedient in the interest of justice that criminal proceedings are put to an end.

In this view of the matter, the petition is allowed and FIR No. 264 dated 13.12.2013 for offence punishable under Sections 406, 498-A and 506 IPC registered with Police Station Sector 14, Panchkula and proceedings emanating therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 09.07.2016 stand quashed qua the petitioners.

(Rekha Mittal)
Judge

27.01.2017
mohan bimbra

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
whether reportable	:	Yes/No

