

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

Crl. Misc. M-42011 of 2017 (O&M)
Date of Decision: December 19, 2017

Jasvir Kaur and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present:- Mr. Vikas Gupta,, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. A.S. Dhaliwal, DAG Punjab.

Mr. Vivek Singla, Advocate for
Mr. Shivam Jindal, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

JAISHREE THAKUR, J. (Oral)

At the very outset, learned counsel for the petitioners herein contends that inadvertently while typing the headnote and the prayer clause, Section 120-B of Indian Penal Code, which was subsequently added, was not added in the petition. He seeks permission of the court to make necessary changes in the petition itself.

He is permitted to do so, under his signatures.

This petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure seeking quashing of FIR No.188 dated 17.09.2017 registered under Sections 498-A, 406, 376, 511, 120-B of Indian Penal Code at Police Station Sadar Tarn Taran, District Tarn Taran (Annexure P/1) and

all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom in view of the compromise (Annexure P/2).

The FIR has been registered on the statement of complainant-Amritpal Kaur on the allegations that after her marriage, the accused-petitioners started harassing her for the demand of dowry. 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 trial court/Illaqua Magistrate for getting their statements recorded in support of the compromise. In pursuance of the direction, a report has been received from Addl. Chief Judicial Magistrate at Tarn Taran, stating that the compromise arrived at between the parties is without any pressure or coercion from any one and the same is genuine one.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from the Investigating Officer and learned counsel for the complainant-respondent No.2 admit the factum of compromise and submit that in case the parties have indeed settled their dispute, the State 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 parties and have 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 **Gian Singh Versus State of Punjab and another, 2012 (4) RCR (Cr.) 543**, this petition is allowed and FIR No.188 dated 17.09.2017 registered under Sections 498-A, 406, 376, 511, 120-B of Indian Penal Code at Police Station Sadar Tarn Taran, District Tarn Taran and all subsequent proceedings arising out of the same are quashed.

The petition stands disposed of.

December 19, 2017

vijay saini

**(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes
Yes/No