

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

CRM-M-13469-2019
Date of Decision:-**30.09.2022**

GURMEJ KAUR AND OTHERS

... Petitioners

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KARAMJIT SINGH

Present:- Mr. L.S. Mann, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Jaspal Singh Guru, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Ishan Gupta, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

KARAMJIT SINGH, J. (Oral)

Present petition is for quashing of FIR No.65 dated 27.4.2013 registered under Sections 452, 324, 323, 506, 34 IPC (Section 326 IPC and Section 324 IPC deleted later on) at Police Station Shahkot, District Jalandhar and judgment dated 15.12.2018 passed by Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Nakodar (Annexure P-2) on the basis of compromise (Annexure P-3) along with other consequential proceedings arising thereto.

The FIR in question was registered on the statement of respondent No.2-Narinder Kaur against the petitioners.

On notice of motion, respondent No.2 appeared in the Court through her counsel and pleaded that she has no objection if the aforesaid FIR and judgment of conviction and order of sentence are quashed on the basis of the aforesaid compromise which has been effected between the parties.

During the course of preliminary hearing, the Court concerned was directed to record the statements of the all the concerned parties with regard to genuineness and validity or otherwise of the aforesaid compromise.

In compliance thereof, report from the Court of Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Nakodar along with statements of the parties has been received, in which, it is mentioned that the compromise is genuine and there was no undue influence or coercion from any side.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties

Learned counsel for the parties are *ad idem* that in view of the settlement effected between the parties, the present petition deserves to be accepted. It has also come on record that the aforesaid compromise is genuine and the parties effected the same without any undue influence or coercion.

A Division Bench of this Court in **Sube Singh and Another vs. State of Haryana and Another, 2013(4) RCR(Criminal) 102** allowed the compromise quashing petition and quashed the FIR as well as all the subsequent thereof including judgment and order passed by the Court of

Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate whereby the accused persons were convicted and sentenced to imprisonment and further held that the appeal preferred by the accused persons against the aforesaid judgment and order has been rendered infructuous.

Recently the Hon'ble Apex Court in **Criminal Appeal No.1393 of 2011** titled as **Ramawatar vs. State of Madhya Pradesh** decided on 25.10.2021 quashed all the proceedings including judgment and order of conviction and sentence passed by the trial Court against which the appeal was pending in the High Court, on the basis of the compromise effected between the parties.

In the case in hand, the parties have effected compromise. In view of the compromise, respondent No.2 does not want to take any further action against the petitioners. I am of the view that the aforesaid compromise is in the welfare and interest of the parties and will enable the parties to live in peace and enjoy their life in a dignified manner. So no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping the proceedings pending in the Appellate Court.

For the reasons aforestated and having regard to the law laid down by Hon'ble Apex Court in **Gian Singh v. State of Punjab and another, 2012 (4) RCR (Criminal) 543** and Five Judges Bench of this Court in **Kulwinder Singh and others v. State of Punjab and another, 2007(3) RCR (Criminal) 1052**, this petition is allowed and FIR No.65 dated 27.4.2013 registered under Sections 452, 324, 323, 506, 34 IPC (Section 326 IPC and Section 324 IPC deleted later on) at Police Station Shahkot, District Jalandhar and judgment dated 15.12.2018 passed by Judicial

Magistrate Ist Class, Nakodar (Annexure P-2) along with other consequential proceedings arising thereto are quashed on the basis of compromise (Annexure P-3).

Resultantly, the appeal preferred by the petitioners against the aforesaid judgment and order dated 15.12.2018 (Annexure P-2), pending in the Court of Additional Session Judge, Jalandhar would be rendered infructuous.

The present petition stands allowed in the aforesaid terms.

(KARAMJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

30.09.2022
Gaurav Sorot

Whether reasoned / speaking? Yes / No

Whether reportable? Yes / No