

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

**CRM-M No.28616 of 2020 (O&M)
Date of Decision.29.10.2020
(Heard through VC)**

Rishab Singla and another

...Petitioners

Vs

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM:HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present: Mr. Arjun Veer Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Ms. Monika Jalota, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Shivam Malhotra, Advocate
for respondent No.2-complainant.

-.-

JAISHREE THAKUR J. (ORAL)

1. This petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure seeking quashing of FIR No.81 dated 13.09.2019 registered under Sections 406, 498-A, 506 IPC at Police Station Women, Police Commissionerate Jalandhar (Annexure P-1) and all other consequential proceedings arising therefrom in view of the compromise dated 03.06.2019 (Annexure P-2).

2. The FIR has been registered on the statement of complainant on the allegations of ill-treatment and harrasment at the hands of accused-petitioners for demand of dowry. Now with the intervention of respectable persons, the matter has been amicably compromised between the parties namely Rishab Singla, Rajni Singla and the complainant and they have resolved their disputes

and differences.

3. Keeping in view the fact that the said 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 has been received from Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Jalandhar stating that the compromise arrived at between the parties is without any pressure or coercion from any one and the same is genuine one.

4. Learned Deputy Advocate General, Punjab on instructions from the Investigating Officer and Mr. Shivam Malhotra, Advocate for the complainant admit the factum of compromise *inter se the* parties but submit that the compromise has not been effected with Ganesh Dass, accused in the FIR. The counsel for the respondent-State submits that in case the parties have indeed settled their dispute, the State would have no objection to the quashing of the partial FIR, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Parambir Singh Gill Vs. Malkiat Kaur 2010 (1) RCR (Crl.) 256.**

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record.

6. 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.

7. 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.81 dated 13.09.2019 registered under Sections 406, 498-A, 506 IPC at Police Station Women, Police Commissionerate Jalandhar (Annexure P-1) and all subsequent proceedings arising out of the same are quashed qua petitioners.

(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE

October 29, 2020
Pankaj*

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No