

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

**Crl. Misc. M- 48090-2017 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 11.09.2018**

Ajay

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

...Respondent(s)

CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present:- Mr. Jitender Nara, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Gaganpreet Kaur, AAG, Haryana

Mr. Rajnikant Upadyay, 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. 45 dated 15.07.2016 registered under Section 120-B, 354, 406, 498-A and 506 of Indian Penal Code at Police Station Women, Police Station Sonipat, District Sonipat (Annexure P/1) and all proceedings arising therefrom in view of the compromise dated 19.08.2017 (Annexure P/2).

The aforesaid FIR has been registered on the statement of complainant-respondent No.2-Rani, on the allegations that the accused-petitioner and his family harassed, tortured and gave beatings to her for not bringing enough dowry as also allegations of molestation at the hands of family members of the petitioner. Now with the intervention of respectable

persons, the matter has been amicably compromised between the parties and they have resolved their disputes and differences.

Keeping in view the fact that the parties have entered into a compromise, they were directed to appear before the trial court/Illaq Magistrate for getting their statements recorded in support of the compromise. In pursuance of the direction, a report dated 18.08.2018 has been received from Judicial Magistrate First Class at Sonapat forwarded by the District & Sessions Judge, Sonapat, stating that the compromise arrived at between the parties is without any pressure or coercion from any one and the same is genuine one.

Learned Assistant Advocate General, Haryana, on instructions from the Investigating Officer and learned counsel for the complainant-respondent No.2 admit the factum of compromise and submit that in case the parties have indeed settled their dispute, the State 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 parties and have 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 and others vs. State of Punjab and another, (2014) 6 SCC 466**, this petition is allowed and FIR No. 45 dated 15.07.2016 registered under Section 120-B, 354, 406, 498-A and 506 of Indian Penal Code at Police Station Women, District Sonapat and all proceedings arising out of the same are quashed qua the petitioner.

The petition stands disposed of.

September 11, 2018

seema

**(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No