

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

1. Crl. Misc. No. M-38708 of 2016

Gurbaksh KaurPetitioner

versus

State of U.T. Chandigarh and ors. ...Respondents

2. Crl. Misc. No. M-44843 of 2016

JagdeepPetitioner

versus

State of U.T. Chandigarh and ors. ...Respondents

Date of decision : 20.02.2017

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RITU BAHRI

Present: Mr. Liaqat Ali, Advocate
for the petitioner in both cases

Ms. Aashima Mor, Advocate for U.T. Chandigarh

Mr. G.S. Salana, Advocate
for respondent No. 2 and 3 in both cases

RITU BAHRI, J. (Oral)

This order shall dispose of the above two petitions as common question of law and facts are involved in these petitions wherein prayer is for quashing of F.I.R No. 286 dated 14.07.2015, under Sections 498-A/406 IPC, registered at P.S. Sector 39, Chandigarh, on the basis of compromise deed dated 19.08.2016 (P-2)

Petitioner-Jagdeep Singh performed marriage with respondent

No. 3 on 02.02.2015. Due to temperamental differences, they could not live together as husband and wife and F.I.R has been registered by the father of respondent No. 3 i.e respondent No. 2 against the petitioner on account of bringing less dowry and harassment caused by the petitioners.

However, the matter has now been duly compromised, vide compromise deed dated 19.08.2016 (P-2)

In compliance of order dated 27.10.2016 and 16.12.2016, report dated 30.11.2016 and 15.02.2017 Judl. Magistrate 1st Class, Chandigarh has been received in this regard. As per reports, statement of parties have been recorded. The complainant stated that the matter stands compromised between the parties and he does not want to proceed further against the accused and has no objection, if the present F.I.R be quashed against the petitioners. To the same effect is the statement given by her daughter i.e respondent No. 3. The compromise has been entered voluntarily. To the same effect is the statement given by the petitioner- Gurbaksh Kaur. She has accepted the compromise on behalf of her son as well being power of attorney.

Consequently, in view of the status reports dated 30.11.2016 and 15.02.2017 and in view of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Dr. Arvind Barsaul etc. versus State of Madhya Pradesh and another 2008(2) RCR (Criminal) 910***, no useful purpose would be served in prolonging the litigation.

Accordingly, F.I.R No. 286 dated 14.07.2015, under Sections 498-A/406 IPC, registered at P.S. Sector 39, Chandigarh, is quashed along

with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom qua petitioners.

The petitions stand disposed of.

20.02.2017

G Arora

(RITU BAHRI)

JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>No</i>