

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

**CRM-M No.27575 of 2021 (O&M)
Date of Decision:13.10.2021
(Heard through VC)**

Amit ...Petitioner

Vs

State of Haryana and another . ..Respondents

CORAM:HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present: Ms. Sandeep Thakan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Deepshikha Chauhan, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Karan Singh, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

JAISHREE THAKUR J. (ORAL)

1. This petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure seeking quashing of FIR No.54 dated 16.05.2019 registered under Sections 3(2)(v), 3(2)(va) of SC and ST (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 (Amendment 2015) and Sections 354-A(2), 354-D, 506 Indian Penal Code at Women Police Station, District Bhiwani and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise effected between the parties (Annexure P-4).

2. The FIR has been registered on the statement of complainant on the allegations of sexual harrasment, defaming her image and threat to life to her and her family members at the hands of the accused-petitioner. 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 Additional Sessions Judge, Bhiwani 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 No.2 admit the factum of compromise.

5. Learned counsel for the respondent-State would point out that the provisions of Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe (Prevention of Atrocities) Act have also been invoked in these proceedings. However, she 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.

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

7. 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.

8. As the matter has been compromised and parties are residing

together happily, no useful purpose would be served in allowing the proceedings under the FIR to be continued. 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.54 dated 16.05.2019 registered under Sections 3(2)(v), 3(2)(va) of SC and ST (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 (Amendment 2015) and Sections 354-A(2), 354-D, 506 Indian Penal Code at Women Police Station, District Bhiwani and all subsequent proceedings arising out of the same are quashed qua petitioner.

(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE

October 13, 2021

P.Bhatt

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No

Whether reportable Yes/No