

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

CRM-M-30372-2018

Date of decision: 22.10.2018

Rajni and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI

Present: Mr. Parminder Singh, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Brijesh Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

Ms. Kanchan Jagat, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI, J.(Oral)

By invoking Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the petitioners have prayed for quashing of FIR No.45 dated 11.01.2018, under Sections 384, 420, 504, 506, 120-B of the Indian Penal Code (for short 'IPC') and Sections 66 E, 67, 67A of the IT Act, registered at Police Station Civil Lines, Karnal and subsequent proceedings arising on the basis of compromise (Annexure P-2).

In the present case, the FIR was registered on the statement of Naveen Kumar Goyal son of Rakesh Kumar. Now, dispute between the parties has been resolved.

Vide order dated 20.07.2018, the parties were directed to appear before the learned trial court/illqa magistrate to get their statements recorded with regard to genuineness of compromise.

Pursuant thereto, a report has been submitted by the learned Civil Judge (Junior Division)-cum-Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Karnal wherein it has been reported that statements of the parties have been

recorded and compromise entered between the parties is genuine, valid, without any pressure, coercion or undue influence.

Learned counsel for the State as well as learned counsel for respondent No.2 have not disputed that the parties i.e. petitioners, 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 v. State of Punjab and another', 2012 (4) R.C.R. (Criminal) 543** and in the light of facts and circumstances discussed hereinbefore, 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 and FIR No.45 dated 11.01.2018, under Sections 384, 420, 504, 506, 120-B IPC and Sections 66 E, 67, 67A of the IT Act, registered at Police Station Civil Lines, Karnal and subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise stands quashed qua the petitioners.

October 22, 2018
m. sharma

(RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	yes/no
Whether reportable	:	yes/no