

224

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**CRM-M-10367-2019
Date of Decision: 05.04.2021**

Lal Chand and others

..... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDIP AHLUWALIA

Present: Mr. Rajesh Dhankar, Advocate, for
Mr. Neeraj Kumar Sura, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. Vishal Malik, DAG, Haryana,
for respondent No.1/State.

Mr. Balkar Singh, Advocate,
for respondent No.2/Complainant.

SUDIP AHLUWALIA J. (ORAL)

In this petition, the petitioners, who are the accused persons in F.I.R No.681, dated 26.10.2017, under Sections 498-A, 406, 506, 323, 328, 377, 313 and 120-B of the IPC, registered at Police Station City Sonapat, District Sonapat (Annexure P-1), have prayed for quashing of F.I.R. with all subsequent proceedings, on the basis of compromise.

[2]. With the intervention of respectables and elderly people of the society, the complainant has arrived at a settlement with the accused vide Memorandum of Settlement/Compromise (Annexure P-2), which is duly signed by her. The matter was referred to the Court below for recording of statements of the parties and to report with respect to genuineness of the compromise arrived at between the parties. Ld. Additional District and

Sessions Judge, Sonapat, has apprised this Court that the compromise arrived at between the parties is genuine and without any pressure

[3]. Seen the Letter No.281 dated 27.05.2019, now sent up by the Ld. Additional District and Sessions Judge, Sonapat, in which it has been clarified with reference to the noting made in the earlier order dated 06.05.2019 that statements of the other three accused persons were not mentioned in the previous report as their names had already been deleted when supplementary Challan was submitted on 23.10.2018 in the Ld. Trial Court, and in addition offence under Section 120-B of the IPC had also been deleted.

[4]. The explanation in the given circumstances does appear to be satisfactory. Therefore, there is no need to again call for the Compromise Report with regard to the said three other accused persons.

[5]. Respondent No.2 is represented by her Counsel through Video Conferencing, who does not dispute the compromise.

[6]. In view of the Reports/Letter Nos.243 dated 02.05.2019 and 281 dated 27.05.2019, and the decisions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **"Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab and another", 2012(4) RCR (Criminal) 543** and **"Narinder Singh and Others Vs. State of Punjab and Another", (2014) 6 SCC 466**, this Court is of the opinion that no useful purpose can be served by keeping with the criminal proceedings pending, since the complainant has herself compromised the dispute with the petitioners/accused persons.

[7]. In the circumstances, the present petition is allowed. F.I.R No.681, dated 26.10.2017, under Sections 498-A, 406, 506, 323, 328, 377, 313 and 120-B of the IPC, registered at Police Station City Sonapat, District

Sonepat (Annexure P-1), with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, is hereby quashed qua the present petitioners.

05.04.2021

Bhumika

**(SUDIP AHLUWALIA)
JUDGE**

1. Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
2. Whether reportable: No