

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

114

**CRM-M-36400-2018 (O&M)
Date of Decision : 06.10.2018**

Anup

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P.B.BAJANTHRI

Present: Mr.S.S.Verma, Advocate for the petitioner.

P.B. BAJANTHRI, J.(ORAL)

In the instant petition, petitioner has sought for quashing of FIR No. 191 dated 28.03.2018 under Section 420, 438, 471, 506, 120-B IPC registered at police Station, Dadri Sadar, District Charkhi Dadri and all other consequential proceedings arising therefrom.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that compromise statements have already been recorded before the trial court. Learned counsel for the State while resisting his contention submitted that investigation is yet to be completed. Therefore, parties cannot enter into compromise as certain facts are yet to be verified.

3. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

4. Having regard to the above facts and circumstances, read with Supreme Court decision titled as ***Munshiram versus State of Rajasthan and another etc.*** reported in 2018(5) SCC 678 to the extent entertaining petition to quash FIR under Section 482 Cr.P.C.would be permissible only as and when investigation is completed. Therefore, present petition is premature. Accordingly, petition stands dismissed. Reserving liberty to the petitioner as and when investigation is complete, he can move petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of present FIR.

06.10.2018

pooja saini

**(P.B. BAJANTHRI)
JUDGE**

*Whether speaking/reasoned?
Whether reportable?*

*Yes/No
Yes/No*