

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

CRM-M-14724-2017 (O&M)

Date of decision: January 12, 2018

Rahul Bedi

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI

Present: Ms. Sunita Nambiar, Advocate for
Mr. Abhimanyu Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Brijesh Sharma, AAG, Haryana
for respondent No.1-State.

Mr. Kuldeep Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Angrej Singh, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI, J.(ORAL)

Prayer in this petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is for quashing of F.I.R. No.95 dated 10.02.2017, under Sections 34, 384, 441, 506 of Indian Penal Code, registered at Police Station Badshahpur, District Gurugram (Annexure P-1) and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 22.04.2017 (Annexure P-2).

This Court vide order dated 01.05.2017 had directed the parties to appear before the Illaqa Magistrate to get their statements recorded and the learned Magistrate was directed to send its report qua the genuineness of the compromise.

Pursuant to the aforesaid order, parties have appeared before learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Gurugram and got their statements

recorded. On the basis of the statements so recorded, learned Magistrate has submitted report dated 31.05.2017 to the effect that the parties have compromised their dispute amicably and their compromise is genuine, voluntary and without any coercion and undue influence.

Respondent No.2-complainant, namely, Ravinder Singh has made a statement with regard to compromise before learned Magistrate on 26.05.2017 which reads as under:-

“Stated that I have entered into compromise with the accused in the present FIR out of my own free will and without any pressure on me due to intervention of common friends. Now no ill will or animosity remains amongst us. The compromise in question is genuine and valid. I have no objection in case the present FIR against the accused is quashed by Hon'ble High Court.”

Learned State counsel as well as learned counsel for respondent No.2 have not disputed the factum of compromise between the parties.

In view of the above, no useful purpose would be served to continue with the proceedings before the trial Court in the instant F.I.R. and it will amount to abuse of the process of law.

Following the principles laid down by the Full Bench judgment of this Court in **Kulwinder Singh and others Versus State of Punjab and another 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052** and approved by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Gian Singh Versus State of Punjab and others (2012) 10 SCC 303**, this petition is allowed and F.I.R. No.95 dated 10.02.2017, under Sections 34, 384, 441, 506 of Indian Penal Code, registered at Police Station Badshahpur, District Gurugram (Annexure P-1) and all subsequent

proceedings arising therefrom are quashed qua the petitioner on the basis of compromise dated 22.04.2017 (Annexure P-2).

January 12, 2018
m. sharma

(RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
Whether reportable?	Yes/No