

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

-.-

Crl. Misc. M 45735 of 2016
Date of decision: 15.03.2017

Rajat Soota and another

..... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

.....Respondents

Coram: Hon'ble Mrs. Justice Rekha Mittal

-.-

Present: Mr. Ashit Malik, Advocate
for the petitioners

Mr. Pawan Garg, AAG, Haryana

Mr. Pawan Attari, 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 petitioners have prayed for quashing of FIR No. 28 dated 14.06.2014 for offence punishable under Sections 498-A, 506, 406 and 323 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code (in short, 'IPC') registered with Women Police Station, District Sonapat and proceedings emanating therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 20.05.2016 (Annexure P-2) arrived at between the parties.

Counsel for the petitioners states that the parties have mutually decided to resolve their personal differences and also decided to part ways vide compromise deed dated 20.05.2016.

Vide order dated 20.12.2016, 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, 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. 28 dated 14.06.2014 for offence punishable under Sections 498-A, 506, 406 and 323 read with Section 34 IPC registered with Women Police Station, District Sonapat and proceedings emanating therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 20.05.2016, stand quashed qua the petitioners. The parties shall remain bound by the terms and conditions of compromise.

(Rekha Mittal)
Judge

15.03.2017
mohan bimbra

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