

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

CRM-M No.29379 of 2020

Date of Decision : 27.01.2021

Sahil and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDIP AHLUWALIA

Present : Mr. Dhruv Gupta, Advocate
for the Petitioners.

Mr. Vishal Malik, Dy. Advocate General, Haryana
for Respondent No.1/State.

Ms. Poorva Gupta, Advocate
for the Complainant/Respondent No.2.

SUDIP AHLUWALIA, J. (ORAL)

In this petition, the Petitioners, who are the accused persons in F.I.R No.290, dated 12.06.2020, under Sections 17/6 of the POCSO Act, 2012 and Section 506 of the Indian Penal Code (Sections 17/6 of the POCSO Act deleted and Section 376 of the IPC added later on), registered at Police Station Shahbad, District Kurukshetra (Annexure P-1), have prayed for quashing of F.I.R. with all subsequent proceedings pending therefrom, on the basis of compromise.

2. Now the Complainant has arrived at a settlement with the accused persons vide Compromise Deed (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. The Ld. Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Shahabad, vide report dated 10.11.2020 has apprised this Court that the compromise arrived at between the parties is genuine and without

any pressure.

3. The Complainant/Respondents No.2 is represented by her Counsel who does not dispute the factum of compromise. It transpires that the marriage of Petitioner No.1 has already been solemnized with the Prosecutrix, on account of which, the Complainant/Respondent No.2 does not wish to take any further action against the Petitioner, who has now become her son-in-law, in the interest of a happy and peaceful married life of the couple.

4. In view of the report of the Ld. Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Shahabad, and in view of the decision 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/Respondent No.2 has herself compromised the dispute with the Petitioners/accused persons.

5. In the circumstances, the present petition is allowed. F.I.R No.290, dated 12.06.2020, under Sections 17/6 of the POCSO Act, 2012 and Section 506 of the Indian Penal Code (Sections 17/6 of the POCSO Act deleted and Section 376 of the IPC added later on), registered at Police Station Shahbad, District Kurukshetra (Annexure P-1), and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, are hereby quashed *qua* the Petitioners.

January 27, 2021

Dpr

(SUDIP AHLUWALIA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No