

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

261

**CRM-M No.26319 of 2021
Date of Decision: 14.09.2022**

Monu Garg

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA

Present:- Mr. Randeep S. Dhull, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Amrik Narwal, DAG, Haryana
for respondent No.1-State.

Mr. Shivek Thakur, Advocate
for Mr. Sanjeev Majra Advocate for respondent No.2.

MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA, J.

By way of the instant petition, the petitioner has invoked the jurisdiction of this Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C for seeking the quashing of the FIR bearing No.340 dated 02.06.2021 registered at Police Station Ballabgarh City, District Faridabad, under Section 379-A IPC as well as all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom, while averring that the parties have arrived at a compromise qua their dispute, leading to the registration of the said FIR.

2. Shorn and short of unnecessary details, the allegations, as levelled by informant Sitara in the subject FIR, are that on 02.06.2021, she had gone to the Central Bank and while she was on her way back to her

home, a motor-cycle borne boy came there and snatched the purse that she was carrying in her hand and fled away and she had noticed that the registration number of the said motor-cycle was HR-29X-0241.

3. Vide the order dated 12.11.2021 as passed by this Court, the private parties were directed to appear before learned Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court on 11.01.2022 for recording their statements in respect of the said compromise. In compliance of the above-said order, learned Sessions Judge, Faridabad, recorded their (parties') statements and has submitted his report (which is already available on the file) mentioning therein that the compromise has been effected between the petitioner and respondent No.2 voluntarily and without any threat, pressure, undue influence or coercion and that as per the statement of the Investigating Officer ASI Vijay, there is only one accused, i.e the petitioner and he has not been declared as proclaimed person nor any other criminal case is pending against him. Separate statements of respondent No.2-complainant, the petitioner and the afore-named Investigating Officer have also been annexed with the above-mentioned report.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel and learned counsel for respondent No.2 in the present petition and have also perused the file thoroughly.

5. The afore-said compromise has been effected to put the dispute between the parties at rest for all the times to come and the same would promote peaceful, harmonious and cordial relations between them. It being so, there are bleak chances of the conviction of the petitioner and in

these circumstances, the continuation of the proceedings in the case arising out of the said FIR, would be an exercise in futility.

6. Keeping in view the above-discussed facts and circumstances and also the observations as made by the Apex Court in **Gian Singh Versus State of Punjab and another (2012) 4 RCR (Criminal) 543**, the FIR bearing No.340 dated 02.06.2021 registered at Police Station Ballabgarh City, District Faridabad, under Section 379-A IPC as well as all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom (if any), are hereby quashed. The petition in hand stands allowed accordingly.

14.09.2022
neetu

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes*
Whether Reportable: *No*