

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

119

**CRM-M-49617-2021 (O&M)
Decided on : 25.02.2022**

Varun Verma and others

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and another

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

PRESENT: Mr. Tushar Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Ms. Gaganpreet Kaur, AAG, Haryana.

Ms. Pooja Yadav, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (Oral)

CRM-6319-2022

This is an application under Section 482 Cr.PC for pre-poning the date of hearing in the main case from 10.10.2022 to an early date.

After hearing learned counsel for the parties, perusing the averments made in the application, same is allowed and the date of hearing in the instant case is advanced from 10.10.2022 to today itself.

CRM-M-49617-2021

The instant petition is for quashing of FIR No. 0184, dated 17.06.2017, under Sections 34, 406, 498-A, 506 of IPC, registered at Women Police Station, Gurgaon (annexed as Annexure P-1) and all the consequential proceedings arising out of the same, on the basis of compromise dated 05.08.2021 (annexed as Annexure P-2), arrived at between the parties.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that it was on account of temperamental differences and marital discord between the parties, the FIR in question came to be registered. However, subsequently, the parties amicably resolved their disputes by way of compromise dated 05.08.2021 (Annexure P-2).

Vide order dated 29th November, 2021, of this Court, the parties were directed to appear before the learned Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court on

24th December, 2021, to get their statements recorded, regarding the compromise arrived at, between them.

Report has since been received from the learned JMIC, Gurugram, 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 photocopies of the statements of the parties along with its report.

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

In view of the report of the learned learned JMIC, Gurugram, 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 25, 2022

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No