

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

CRM-M-8429-2018
Date of decision: 24.04.2018

Promila and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present:- Mr. Yogesh Goel, Advocate
for the petitioners.

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

Mr. Deepak Goyal, 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. 33 dated 24.01.2018, registered under Sections 9/10/11 of the Prohibition of Child Marriage Act, 2006 at Police Station Sonipat Sadar, District Sonipat (Annexure P-1) and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom in view of the compromise (Annexure P-2) entered into between the parties.

The aforesaid FIR was registered on the statement of respondent No. 2/complainant Ramesh with the allegations that petitioners No. 1 and 2 have married their minor daughters, namely Sapna and Shivani, petitioners No. 3 and 4 respectively, to Deepak and Pardeep, petitioners No. 7 and 8, respectively. 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 ACJM at Sonipat, 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.

Reply, filed on behalf of the respondent-State is taken on record. 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. 33 dated 24.01.2018, registered under Sections 9/10/11 of the Prohibition of Child Marriage Act, 2006 at Police Station Sonipat Sadar, District Sonipat (Annexure P-1) and all subsequent proceedings arising out of the same are quashed qua the petitioners herein.

The petition stands disposed of.

24.04.2018
Waseem Ansari

(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No