

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

**CRM-M-20282 of 2016**

**Date of Decision: 05.02.2018.**

**Sonali**

**...Petitioner**

**Versus**

**State of Punjab and anr.**

**...Respondents**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI**

Present: Mr. Sunny Deep Joneja, Advocate  
for the petitioners.

Mr. Ajay Pal Singh Gill, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. K.S. Khaira, Advocate for  
Mr. R.Kartikeya, Advocate  
for respondent No. 2.

\*\*\*\*

**RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI, J. (ORAL)**

By invoking Section 482 Cr.P.C., petitioners have prayed for quashing of FIR No. 95 dated 25.06.2015 under Section 380 IPC registered at P.S. Jamalpur, Ludhiana (Annexure P-1) and proceedings emanating therefrom on the basis of compromise (Annexure P-2) arrived at between the parties.

In the present case, the FIR was registered on the statement of Chetan Garg. Now, dispute between the parties has been resolved by way of compromise Annexure P-2.

Vide order dated 07.10.2016, the parties were directed to appear before the Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court to get their statements recorded with regard to genuineness of compromise.

Pursuant thereto, a report has been submitted by the Judicial

Magistrate, 1<sup>st</sup> Class, Ludhiana wherein it has been reported that statements of the parties have been recorded and they have voluntarily compromised the matter. As such the compromise is genuine, voluntary and without any coercion or undue influence.

Both the counsels have not disputed that parties i.e. petitioner and respondent No. 2 (complainant) have arrived at a settlement with an intent to give burial to their differences.

Perusal of allegations in the FIR 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 Cr.P.C. Keeping in view, authoritative enunciation of law laid down by Hon'ble the Supreme Court in 'Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab and another' 2012 (4) R.C. R. (Criminal) 543 and in the light of facts and circumstances discussed hereinabove, 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 the same are put to an end.

For the foregoing reasons, the petition is allowed, FIR No. 95 dated 25.06.2015 under Section 380 IPC registered at P.S. Jamalpur, Ludhiana (Annexure P-1) and proceedings emanating therefrom stand quashed qua the petitioner.

(RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI)  
JUDGE

05.02.2018

Harish Kumar

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No  
Whether Reportable: Yes/No