

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

Crl. Misc. No. M-38501 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of decision: May 3, 2017

Lekh Raj

.. Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

.. Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURINDER GUPTA

Present: Mr.Vikas Kumar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mrs.Harpreet Kaur, Asstt. AG, Haryana.

Mr.Harpal Singh, Advocate,
for the complainant-respondent No.2.

SURINDER GUPTA, J.(Oral)

The petitioner has filed this petition under Section 482 Code of Criminal Procedure (for short, 'Cr.P.C.') seeking quashing of FIR No.1004 dated 10.12.2013 (Annexure P-1) along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, registered for offences punishable under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of Indian Penal Code (for short 'IPC') at Police Station City Ballabgarh, District Faridabad on the basis of the compromise.

As per case of the prosecution, the petitioners allured complainant-respondent No.2 to enter into an agreement for purchase of 26K-5M land for ₹ 1.5 crores by showing him papers to represent that this land had been allotted in his name. Documents produced by petitioner and his representation about title of suit land was found to be false.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the matter has

respondent No.2 to this effect has been placed on file as Annexure P-2.

Learned counsel for respondent No.2-complainant endorsed the submission of learned counsel for the petitioners and has no objection if the impugned FIR (Annexure P-1) is quashed.

Learned State counsel has also not disputed compromise.

In order to verify the veracity and genuineness of the settlement between the parties, they were directed to appear before the trial court and get their statements recorded. The trial court has sent its report dated 13.12.2016 stating therein that the compromise has been effected between the complainant and the accused which appears to be voluntary in nature and without any pressure or influence.

Keeping all the above facts in view, I am of the considered opinion that it is a fit case in which the impugned FIR should be quashed. Keeping the case pending will not serve the ends of justice. The quashing of the FIR will provide the parties to this petition an opportunity to live in an amicable, peaceful and harmonious atmosphere which is not only in the interest of the parties but also for their families and ultimately the society at large.

For the reasons as discussed above, the instant petition is allowed and the impugned FIR No.1004 dated 10.12.2013 (Annexure P-1) registered at PS City Ballabgarh, Faridabad along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, qua petitioners, is quashed.

May 3, 2017

Paritosh Kumar

(SURINDER GUPTA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No