

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

223

(Through Video Conferencing)

CRM-M-53801-2021

Date of decision: 22.02.2022

Manpreet Singh and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. Pranjal Vats, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Karan Sharma, DAG, Haryana
for respondent No.1-State.

Ms. Bhawana Chaudhary, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

The instant petition is for quashing of FIR No.0091 dated 10.11.2020 under Sections 323, 377, 406, 498A, 506 and 509 IPC registered at Women Police Station, Sector 5, Panchkula and the consequential proceedings arising out of the same, on the basis of compromise/settlement dated 13.10.2021 (Annexure P-2) arrived at, between the parties.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that it is on account of a matrimonial dispute between the parties that the FIR in question came to be registered, however, subsequently vide Annexure P-2, the matter has been amicably settled before the Mediation and Conciliation Center of this Court.

Learned counsel appearing for respondent No.2 does not dispute the submissions made by counsel opposite and also does not

oppose the prayer for quashing of FIR on the basis of compromise arrived at between the parties.

Vide order dated 22.12.2021 of this Court, the parties were directed to appear before the learned trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate on 21.01.2022 to get their statements recorded regarding the compromise arrived at, between them.

Report has since been received from learned Judicial Magistrate, Ist Class, Panchkula, 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 a 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, alongwith its report.

Learned State counsel too submits that there are 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 Judicial Magistrate, Ist Class, Panchkula and the principles laid down by the Apex Court in ***Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab and others (2012) 10 SCC 303***, and also by the Full Bench of this Court in ***Narinder Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and another, 2014(2) RCR (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.

22.02.2022

Vinay

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No