

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

CRM-M-35850-2018

Date of decision: 14.11.2018

Sahil Verma and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present: Mr. Sanjeev Kodan, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Ms. Rajni Gupta, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Alankar Narula, Advocate, for
Mr. Prateek Gupta, Advocate,
for respondent No.2.

JAISHREE THAKUR, J. (ORAL)

This petition has been filed by the petitioners under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure seeking quashing of FIR No. 86 dated 30.03.2016 under Sections 498-A/ 406 IPC, registered at Police Station Sohana, District SAS Nagar (Mohali) (Annexure P-1) and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of the compromise entered into between the parties.

The marriage of petitioner No.1 was solemnized with the complainant/respondent No.2 on 17.02.2012 as per Hindu rites and

ceremonies. Out of this wedlock no child was born. However, due to temperamental differences between the husband and wife, matrimonial dispute arose and the aforesaid FIR has been registered on the statement of complainant/respondent No.2. However, now with the intervention of respectable persons, the matrimonial dispute has been amicably settled between the parties. A settlement /agreement has been entered into between the parties, a copy thereof is annexed with the petition.

Keeping in view the fact that the parties have entered into a compromise, they were directed to appear before the Illaqa Magistrate where proceedings under Section 13-B of the Hindu Marriage act were pending for getting their statements recorded in support of the compromise. In pursuance of the direction, learned counsel for the petitioners furnished a certified copy of the decree of divorce wherein it is reflected that the complainant/respondent No.2 has received her past, present and future alimony and also received one gift deed of a property situated in Mohal Kailar, HB No. 658, Tehsil and District Solan, HP, along with all gold ornaments. In view of this, the compromise arrived at between the parties seems to be without any pressure or coercion from any one and the same appears to be genuine one.

Ms. Rajni Gupta, learned Sr. DAG, Punjab, on instructions from the Investigating Officer, and learned counsel for respondent No. 2 admit to the factum of compromise and submit that in case the parties have indeed settled their dispute. they 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 rival parties and 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 & others vs. State of Punjab & another, (2014) 6 SCC 466*, this petition is allowed, FIR No. 86 dated 30.03.2016 under Sections 498-A/ 406 IPC, registered at Police Station Sohana, District SAS Nagar (Mohali) (Annexure P-1) and all subsequent proceedings arising out of the same are quashed qua the petitioner.

The petition stands disposed of.

14.11.2018

Satyawan

**(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes.
No.