

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

-.-

CrI. Misc. M 44144 of 2016

Date of decision: 01.03.2017

Pushpender Singh Yadav

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

..... Respondents

Coram: Hon'ble Mrs. Justice Rekha Mittal

-.-

Present: Mr. Tejpal Singh Dhull, Advocate
for the petitioner
Mr. Amrik Narwal, DAG, Haryana
Mr. Naveen Dahiya, 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 petitioner prays for quashing of FIR No. 600 dated 28.11.2011 for offence punishable under Sections 406, 498-A, 506 read with Section 120-B of the Indian Penal Code (in short, 'IPC') registered with Police Station Ambala Cantt. District Ambala and proceedings emanating therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 21.11.2016 (Annexure P-2) arrived at between the parties.

Counsel for the petitioner states that the petitioner and respondent No. 2 have mutually decided to resolve their personal differences and also decided to part ways vide compromise deed dated 21.11.2016.

Vide order dated 09.12.2016, 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 Judicial

Magistrate Ist Class, Ambala 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 report of the trial Court.

Counsel for respondent No. 2 has conceded to the position.

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. 600 dated 28.11.2011 for offence punishable under Sections 406, 498-A, 506 read with Section 120-B IPC registered with Police Station Ambala Cantt. District Ambala and proceedings emanating therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 21.11.2016, stand quashed qua the petitioner. The parties shall remain bound by the terms and conditions of compromise.

(Rekha Mittal)
Judge

01.03.2017
mohan bimbra

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