

Raj Kumar and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present:- Mr. Abhilaksh Grover, Advocate, for the petitioners.
Mr. Surender Singh, AAG, Haryana.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (Oral)

By this petition, the petitioners seek quashing of FIR No.524, dated 06.12.2019, registered at Police Station Kaithal City, Distirct Kaithal, alleging therein the commission of offences punishable under Sections 406, 420, 467, 468, 471, 506 and 120-B of the IPC, as also all other subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of a compromise (copy Annexure P-2), arrived at between the petitioners and respondent no.2 .

Pursuant to the order of this Court dated 15.12.2020, the report of the learned CJM, Kaithal, dated 07.01.2021, is on record. As per that court, the petitioners as also respondent no.2 (complainant), Vijay Kumar, appeared in person before that court with their statements having been recorded separately, to the effect that the matter has been compromised between the parties, of their own free will.

The statement of the investigating officer was also recorded before that court to the effect that there are only four accused in the FIR and no other

person was involved in the matter and further, there is no other criminal case pending against the accused persons.

Though none appears for respondent no.2 today, however, in view of the statement recorded aforesaid and learned State counsel also submitting that as per the affidavit received by him, of the DSP, Kaithal, in fact a cancellation report has been prepared by the investigating agency, I would see no reason to continue with criminal proceedings.

That being so, FIR No.524, dated 06.12.2019, registered at Police Station Kaithal City, Distirct Kaithal, alleging therein the commission of offences punishable under Sections 406, 420, 467, 468, 471, 506 and 120-B of the IPC, along with all proceedings emanating therefrom, is hereby quashed.

It is to be observed that though a cancellation report is stated to have been prepared by the investigating agency, learned counsel for the petitioners and respondent no.2 submit that it would still mean that the parties would still have to go through further proceedings before the court to which the report is submitted, whereas with the matter having been fully compromised between them, there would really be no reason to do so.

In my opinion, looking at the nature of the offences alleged to have been committed with a settlement having been arrived at between the parties, that contention would be correct.

February 18, 2021

dharamvir/

**(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE**

Whether reasoned/speaking : Yes

Whether reportable: : Yes