

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

**CRM-M-31149-2017
Date of Decision: 07.10.2017**

Tej Pal Singh @ Babbu & others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab & others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present:- Mr. Vishal Munjal, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Luvinder Sofat, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. K. D. Sachdeva, Advocate
for respondents No. 2 to 4.

JAISHREE THAKUR, J. (Oral)

This petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure seeking quashing of FIR No. 76 dated 02.11.2016, under Sections 307, 341, 323, 354-A, 354-B and 34 of the IPC, registered at Police Station Division No. 1, Tehsil and District Pathankot and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom in view of the compromise dated 16.08.2017 (Annexure P-4) entered into between the parties.

The marriage of the daughter of respondent No. 2/complainant was solemnized on 01.05.2013 with petitioner No. 1-Tej Pal Singh @ Babbu as per Sikh rites and rituals. However, due to some differences between the parties, a dispute arose and the aforesaid FIR has been registered on the statement of complainant/respondent No. 2-Sukhdev Singh. Now with the intervention of respectable persons, the dispute has

been amicably settled between the parties and they have entered into a compromise. In fact, petitioner No. 1 and the daughter of the complainant are residing together happily.

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, Pathankot, 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. It is also reported that no PO proceeding is pending against either of the petitioners.

Learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab, on instructions from the Investigating Officer, and learned counsel for respondents No. 2 to 4 admit to 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.

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. 76 dated 02.11.2016, under Sections 307, 341, 323, 354-A, 354-B and 34 of the IPC, registered at Police Station Division No. 1, Tehsil and District Pathankot and all subsequent proceedings arising out of the same are quashed qua the petitioners.

The petition stands disposed of.

07.10.2017

Ansari

(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No