

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

228

**CRM-M-13417-2021
Decided on : 10.02.2022**

Kamal Kishore

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and another

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

(Through Video Conferencing)

PRESENT: Mr. Sylvester Stephen, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Munish Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Alok Mittal, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (Oral)

The instant petition is for quashing of FIR No. 127, dated 29.11.2018, under Sections 323, 406, 498-A of IPC, registered at Police Station Women Police Station, Ambala (annexed as Annexure P-1) and all the consequential proceedings arising out of the same, on the basis of compromise dated 12.02.2021 (annexed as Annexure P-2), arrived at between the parties.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that it was on account of a matrimonial dispute between the parties, the FIR in question came into existence, however, subsequently, the parties arrived at an amicable settlement vide compromise dated 12.02.2021 (Annexure P-2).

Vide order dated 13th December, 2021, of this Court, the parties were directed to appear before the learned Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court on 11th January, 2022, to get their statements recorded in terms of order dated 23rd March, 2021 of this Court, regarding the compromise arrived at, between them.

Report has since been received from the learned JMIC, Ambala, in pursuance to the direction of this Court, wherein, the factum of the compromise arrived at between the parties stands verified and confirmed. As per the report, compromise has indeed been effected between the parties and the same is without any pressure or coercion and out of their free will and the complainant has also made statement to the effect that she would have no objection if the FIR *qua* the accused-petitioners is quashed. The trial Court has annexed the statements of the parties in original along with its report.

Learned State counsel too submits that there is no other accused other than the petitioner and respondent No.2 is the only aggrieved person in the FIR in question.

In view of the report of the learned learned JMIC, Ambala, and the principles laid down by the Apex Court in *Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab and others (2012) 10 SCC 303*, and in *Narinder Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and another, 2014(2) R.C.R. (Criminal) 482*, the instant petition is allowed. The aforesaid FIR and all consequential proceedings arising out of it, are quashed.

Needless to say the parties shall remain bound by the terms of compromise and their statements recorded before the Court below.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

February 10, 2022

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No