

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

**Criminal Misc. No.M-2791 of 2018
Date of Decision: 12.07.2018**

Lokesh Taneja

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana & another

...Respondent(s)

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARI PAL VERMA

Present:- Mr. Tanmoy Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ashok S. Chaudhary, Addl.A.G., Haryana.

HARI PAL VERMA, J. (Oral)

Prayer in this petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is for quashing of FIR No.193 dated 23.05.2014 under Sections 323, 452, 506 IPC and Section 325 IPC (added later on) registered at P.S. Sector 7, Faridabad (Annexure P-1) and subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise (Annexure P-2).

This Court vide order 24.01.2018 had directed the parties to appear before the Illaqa Magistrate/Trial Court to get their statements recorded with regard to compromise so arrived and learned Illaqa Magistrate/Trial Court was directed to submit its report regarding the genuineness of the compromise so effected on the basis of statements so recorded.

Pursuant to the aforesaid order, the parties have appeared before Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Faridabad and got their statements recorded. Learned Magistrate has forwarded his report dated 21.02.2018 to the effect that the compromise and settlement arrived at between the two sides is genuine and voluntary and the complainant Smt. Poonam Kalra has no objection to the FIR registered against the accused persons being quashed. True translation of the statement of the complainant-Poonam Kalra recorded on 19.02.2018 reads as under:-

“Stated that in the abovesaid case, we have effected a compromise with the accused and pursuant to that compromise, in case the FIR is quashed, I have no objection”.

Mr. Garvit Kalra, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of respondent no.2-complainant and filed his *vakalatnama* in Court which is taken on record. He has not disputed the factum of compromise between the parties.

Learned State counsel also does not dispute the factum of compromise effected between the parties.

There is nothing on record to doubt the genuineness of the compromise, as arrived between the parties. Thus, no useful purpose would be served to continue with the proceedings in the instant FIR.

Accordingly, following the principles laid down by the Full Bench judgment of this Court in **Kulwinder Singh and others v. State of Punjab and another**, 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1252 (P&H), as approved by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab and others**, (2012)12 SCC 303, this petition is allowed and FIR No.193 dated 23.05.2014 under Sections 323, 452, 506 IPC and Section 325 IPC (added

later on) registered at P.S. Sector 7, Faridabad (Annexure P-1) and the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom are quashed *qua* the petitioner, on the basis of compromise (Annexure P-2).

July 12, 2018
AK

(HARI PAL VERMA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking / reasoned?
Whether reportable?

Yes / No
Yes / No`