

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

**CRM-M No.7310 of 2020 (O&M)  
Date of Decision:12.11.2021  
(Heard through VC)**

Harsh Vardhan and others

...Petitioners

Vs

State of Haryana and others

..Respondents

**CORAM:HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR**

Present: Mr. N.K. Manchanda, Advocate  
for the petitioners.

Mr. Gurmeet Singh, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Dheeraj Narula, Advocate  
for respondent Nos.2 to 4.

\*\*\*\*\*

**JAISHREE THAKUR J. (ORAL)**

**CRM No.36334 of 2021**

Prayer in the application is for preponement of hearing of the main case, which is now fixed for 19.01.2022.

For the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is allowed and hearing of the main case is preponed and case is taken up for hearing today itself.

**CRM-M No.7310 of 2020**

1. This petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure seeking quashing of FIR No.830 dated 05.11.2015 registered under Sections 323, 427, 341, 506, 148, 149 Indian Penal Code at Police Station Sirsa City, District Sirsa (Annexure P-1) and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise deed arrived at between the parties (Annexure P-2).

2. The FIR has been registered on the statement of complainant on the allegations of physical assault on complainant and his family members by the accused-petitioners. Now with the intervention of respectable persons, the matter has been amicably compromised between the parties and they have resolved their disputes and differences.

3. 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 has been received from Chief Judicial Magistrate, Sirsa 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 Assistant Advocate General, Haryana on instructions from the Investigating Officer and learned counsel for the respondent Nos. 2 to 4 admit the factum of compromise. Learned 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 FIR, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

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.830 dated 05.11.2015 registered under Sections 323, 427, 341, 506, 148, 149 Indian Penal Code at Police Station Sirsa City, District Sirsa (Annexure P-1) and all subsequent proceedings arising out of the same are quashed qua petitioners.

**(JAISHREE THAKUR)**  
**JUDGE**

**November 12, 2021**

P.Bhatt

Whether speaking/reasoned      Yes/No

Whether reportable                  Yes/No