

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA

AT CHANDIGARH

Criminal Misc. No.M-22540 of 2015 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 29.04.2019

Rani Anjali Devendra Singh

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

Union Territory, Chandigarh & another

...Respondent(s)

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARI PAL VERMA

Present:- Mr. Aashish Chopra, Advocate and
Ms. Niharika Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Ashima Mor, APP, UT, Chandigarh.

Mr. R.S. Narang, Advocate
for respondent no.2

HARI PAL VERMA, J. (Oral)

CRM-6748-49-2019:

The applications are allowed. Document Annexure P-3 is
taken on record.

Criminal Misc. No.M-22540 of 2015:

Prayer in this petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is for
quashing of FIR No.143 dated 02.08.2014 under Section 498-A and
Sections 406, 497, 120-B IPC (added later on) registered at Police Station
North, Chandigarh and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom.

At the outset, learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that though initially the FIR was registered under Section 498A IPC, but thereafter, Sections 406, 497 and 120-B IPC were also added. However, during investigation, no offence under Section 497 and 120-B IPC was made out and challan was presented for offence under Sections 406 and 498-A IPC.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has further argued that initially, the present petition was filed by the petitioner-Rani Anjali Devendra Singh, who is mother-in-law of respondent no.2-Saloni Singh, on merits, but now since the matter has been compromised between the parties, it can be dealt with in the light of compromise so made between the parties. It is on the basis of the compromise deed dated 19.12.2018, the FIR *qua* Raj Kumar Bharatendra Singh, husband of respondent no.2 has been quashed by way of separate petition i.e. CRM-M-9582-2019 titled as *Raj Kumar Bharatendra Singh Vs. UT, Chandigarh & anr.* today itself.

Mr. R.S. Narang, Advocate appearing on behalf of respondent no.2-complainant fairly concedes that the matter has been compromised between the parties and he has no objection in case the FIR in question is quashed on the basis of compromise.

Learned APP, on instructions from SI Sat Narain, does not dispute the factum of compromise so effected between the parties in the matter.

The matter having been considered in the light of compromise deed dated 19.12.2018, so arrived between the parties and the pleadings in connected petition i.e. CRM-M-9582-2019, this Court is of the view that no

useful purpose would be served to continue with the proceedings in the instant FIR.

Accordingly, following the principles laid down by Hon'ble the Apex Court in **Gold Quest International Private Ltd. vs. State of Tamil Nadu and others**, 2014(4) RCR (Criminal) 206, the Full Bench judgment of this Court in **Kulwinder Singh and others v. State of Punjab and another**, 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1252 (P&H), as approved by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab and others**, (2012)12 SCC 303, this petition is allowed and FIR No.143 dated 02.08.2014 under Section 406 and 498-A IPC registered at P.S. North, Chandigarh and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom are hereby quashed *qua* the petitioner.

April 29, 2019
AK

(HARI PAL VERMA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking / reasoned?

Yes / No

Whether reportable?

Yes / No`