

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

**CRM-M-37512-2015
Date of decision: 23.03.2018**

Sant Ram Dahiya and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present:- Mr. Sushil Jain, Advocate
for the petitioners.

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

Mr. Vikram Bali, Advocate
for respondent No. 2.

JAISHREE THAKUR, J. (Oral)

This petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure seeking quashing of FIR No. 163 dated 05.08.2015, registered under Sections 406 and 498-A of the Indian Penal Code at Police Station Sector 14, Panchkula (Annexure P-1) and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom in view of the compromise (Annexure P-2) entered into between the parties.

The marriage of respondent No. 2 was solemnized on 22.04.2014 with the son of the petitioners herein as per Hindu rites and rituals. 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 Monika Malik. However, now with the intervention of respectable persons, the matrimonial dispute has been amicably settled between the parties and they have entered

into a compromise. Subsequently, the son of the petitioners has separately filed a petition bearing **CRM-M-2735-2018** for quashing of the FIR on the basis of the said compromise. In fact, the son of the petitioners and the complainant have decided to part ways peacefully and a petition under Section 13-B of the Hindu Marriage Act has already been filed.

Keeping in view the fact that the parties have entered into a compromise, they were directed to appear before the Illaqa Magistrate for getting their statements recorded in support of the compromise. In pursuance of the direction, a report has been received from JMIC at Panchkula, stating that the compromise arrived at between the parties is without any pressure or coercion from any one and the same appears to be genuine one. It is also reported that no PO proceeding is pending against either of the parties.

Mr. P. P. Chahar, DAG, Haryana, 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 and FIR No. 163 dated 05.08.2015, registered under Sections 406 and 498-A of the Indian Penal Code at Police Station Sector 14, Panchkula (Annexure P-1) all subsequent proceedings arising out of the same are quashed qua the petitioners herein.

The petition stands disposed of.

23.03.2018
Waseem Ansari

(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No