

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

**CRM-M No.4392 of 2018 (O&M)**  
**Date of decision: 31.07.2018**

Rameshwar @ Rameshwar Yadav

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI**

Present: Mr. Jagmohan Ghuman, Advocate  
for the petitioners.

Mr. Ashok Muthreja, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Himanshu Puri, Advocate for  
Mr. Neeraj Jain, Advocate  
for respondent No.2/complainant.

**RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI, J.(Oral)**

By invoking Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the petitioner has prayed for quashing of FIR No.565 dated 31.12.2015 for offence punishable under Section 66(C) of the Information Technology Act, 2000, registered at Police Station Udyog Vihar, District Gurugram and subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise/memorandum of understanding (Annexure P-2).

In the present case, the FIR was registered on the statement of Seema Yadav wife of Rameshwar. Now, dispute between the parties has been resolved.

Vide order dated 05.02.2018, the parties were directed to appear before the learned Area Magistrate to get their statements recorded with regard to genuineness of compromise.

Pursuant thereto, a report has been submitted by the Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Gurugram through the District and Sessions Judge, Gurugram wherein it has been reported that statements of the parties have been

recorded and compromise entered between the parties is voluntarily and without any coercion or undue influence.

Learned counsel for the State as well as counsel for respondent No.2 have not disputed that the parties i.e. petitioner, 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, FIR No.565 dated 31.12.2015 for offence punishable under Section 66(C) of the Information Technology Act, 2000, registered at Police Station Udyog Vihar, District Gurugram stands quashed qua the petitioner.

**July 31, 2018**  
*m. sharma*

**(RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI)**  
**JUDGE**

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