

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

Crl. Misc. M 23832 of 2017 (O&M)
Date of decision: 30.4.2018

Sumit and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present: Mr. Surinder Gaur, Advocate
for the petitioners.

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

Mr. RK Hooda, Advocate,
for respondent No.2.

JAISHREE THAKUR, J. (Oral)

This petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure seeking for quashing of FIR No. 189 dated 4.3.2013 (Annexure P/1) registered under Sections 323, 506 read with Section 34 IPC at Police Station Rohtak and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom in view of the statement (Annexure P/3).

The marriage of complainant's daughter—Jyotika, was solemnized with petitioner No.1 on 22.10.2012, as per Hindu rites and ceremonies at Jind. However, it appears that due to temperamental differences between the husband and wife, matrimonial dispute arose and as such FIR No. 322 dated 22.4.2013 was got lodged by the complainant's daughter Jyotika. However, with the intervention of respectable persons, the

matrimonial dispute has been amicably settled between the parties and they have entered into a compromise. The present FIR appears to be the offshoot of the present matrimonial dispute, in which too the parties have compromised.

Keeping in view the fact that the parties have entered into a compromise, they were directed to appear before learned trial court for getting their statements recorded in support of the compromise. In pursuance of the direction, a report has been received from the Judicial Magistrate, 1st Class, Rohtak, 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 matrimonial 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 also 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 matrimonial 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 matrimonial dispute has been amicably settled and in view of the law laid 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. 189 dated 4.3.2013 (Annexure P/1) registered under Sections 323, 506 read with Section 34 IPC at Police Station Rohtak, and all subsequent proceedings arising out of the same are quashed.

The petition stands disposed of.

30.4.2018
prem

(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes
No