

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

**CRM No.M-6761 of 2017
Decided on: 31.05.2017**

Rajinder Garg and others

....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS JUSTICE REKHA MITTAL

Present : Mr. K.S. Malik-I, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Amrik Narwal, DAG, Haryana.

REKHA MITTAL, J. (Oral)

The petitioners have prayed for quashing of Complaint No.13 dated 03.07.2013 (Annexure P1) titled "Madhu vs Rajinder Garg and others" under Sections 498-A, 406, 323, 506 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code (in short 'IPC') on the basis of compromise dated 23.02.2017 (Annexure P2) effected between the parties.

In the present case, the complaint was filed by Madhu daughter of Sh. Kirpa Ram. Now, dispute between the parties has been resolved by way of compromise (Annexure P2).

The parties were directed to appear before the Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court on 06.03.2017 to get their statements recorded with regard to genuineness of compromise.

A report has been submitted by the Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Rohtak, wherein it has been reported that statements of the petitioners and respondent No.2 have been recorded and statements made by the parties in the Court reveal that they have voluntarily entered into a compromise with an intention to live in peace and

harmony.

Counsel for the State has not disputed that the parties have arrived at a settlement with an intent to give burial to their differences.

I have heard counsel for the parties and perused the case file.

Perusal of allegations in the complaint reveals that the present case squarely falls in the category of cases that can be quashed by the High Court, in exercise of its inherent power under Section 482 of the Code. Keeping in view authoritative enunciation of law laid down by Hon'ble the Supreme Court of India in ***“Gian Singh vs 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 view of what has been discussed hereinabove, the petition is allowed and Complaint No.13 dated 03.07.2013 titled “Madhu vs Rajinder Garg and others” under Sections 498-A, 406, 323, 506 read with Section 34 IPC and proceedings emanating therefrom are ordered to be quashed *qua* the petitioners.

31.05.2017
yakub

(REKHA MITTAL)
JUDGE

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