

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

Crl. Misc. M-15869-2018 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 26.09.2018

Sarvesh Bhardwaj and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present:- Mr. Naveen Singh Panwar, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. P.P. Chahar, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Kanwar Satbir Singh, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

JAISHREE THAKUR, J. (Oral)

This petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure seeking quashing of FIR No.0177 dated 27.02.2018 registered under Sections 323, 354, 377, 406, 498A and 506 of Indian Penal Code at Police Station Sonipat City, District Sonipat (Annexure P/1) and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom in view of the compromise dated 21.03.2018 (Annexure P/2).

The FIR has been registered on the statement of complainant-respondent No.2 on the allegations that the accused-petitioners had harassed and tortured her in her matrimonial home for not bringing enough dowry and gave beatings to her and also threatened to kill her. The accused-petitioners also attacked the relatives of complainant-respondent

No.2 when they came to take her along. 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/Illaqa Magistrate for getting their statements recorded in support of the compromise. In pursuance of the direction, a report dated 04.05.2018 has been received from Chief Judicial Magistrate at Sonapat forwarded through District and Sessions Judge, Sonapat, 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 Deputy Advocate General, Haryana, 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 **Narinder Singh and others vs. State of Punjab and another, (2014) 6 SCC 466**, this petition is allowed and FIR No.0177 dated 27.02.2018 registered under Sections 323, 354, 377, 406, 498A and 506 of Indian Penal Code at Police Station Sonipat City, District Sonipat and all subsequent proceedings arising out of the same are quashed.

The petition stands disposed of.

September 26, 2018
seema

(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether reportable	Yes/No