

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

**CRM-M-6176-2018
Date of decision: 03.04.2018**

Rajni Bala and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present:- Mr. Surinder Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. A. S. Sandhu, Addl. A. G., Punjab.

Mr. Vishal Sharma, Advocate
for respondents No. 2 and 3.

JAISHREE THAKUR, J. (Oral)

This petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure seeking quashing of Complaint No. 5817/2013 dated 02.01.2012 titled as ***Sneh Bala vs. Rajni Bala and others***, under Sections 323, 324, 325, 354, 427, 477, 499, 454, 506, 148, 149, 379, 382 and 395 of the IPC, pending in the Court of CJM, Rupnagar, on the basis of compromise dated 27.12.2017 (Annexure P-3) entered into between the parties.

The aforesaid complaint was registered at the behest of respondent No. 2/complainant under the said sections. However, now with the intervention of respectable persons, the dispute has been amicably settled between the parties and they have entered into a compromise.

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 CJM at Rupnagar, 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.

Mr. A. S. Sandhu, Addl. A. G., Punjab and learned counsel for respondents No. 2 and 3 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 Complaint No. 5817/2013 dated 02.01.2012 titled as *Sneh Bala vs. Rajni Bala and others*, under Sections

323, 324, 325, 354, 427, 477, 499, 454, 506, 148, 149, 379, 382 and 395 of the IPC, pending in the Court of CJM, Rupnagar and all subsequent proceedings arising out of the same are quashed qua the petitioners herein.

The petition stands disposed of.

03.04.2018

Waseem Ansari

(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No