

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

Sr. No.:270

**Criminal Miscellaneous No.M-12977 of 2022**

**Date of Decision: March 23, 2023**

Vikas and others

..... PETITIONER(S)

*VERSUS*

State of Haryana and another

..... RESPONDENT(S)

. . .

**CORAM:**      **HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA**

. . .

**PRESENT:** -      Mr. Deepak Vashishth, Advocate for the petitioners.

Ms. Ankita Ahuja, AAG, Haryana,

Mr. Amit Yadav, Advocate for Mr. Amandeep Chhabra,  
Advocate for respondent No.2.

. . .

**Tribhuvan Dahiya, J (Oral)**

The instant petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. seeking quashing of FIR No.08 dated 14.01.2018, registered under Sections 34, 376 (2)(n), 420, 498-A, 506 of IPC, at Police Station Women Cell, District Jind (Annexure P-1) and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, in view of the compromise, dated 14.03.2022 (Annexure P-2), entered into between the petitioner(s) and the complainant to settle their disputes in question.

2.            As per allegations, petitioner No.1-Vikas, who was serving in Army, used to meet the complainant at her college in Hisar. Both of them fall in love, and petitioner No.1 took the complainant to a hotel in Jind, where had physical relations with her several times on the pretext of getting married. When the complainant asked him to get married, he refused. In

order to avoid allegations of rape case and under police pressure, he

solemnized marriage with the complainant on 24.05.2016 at a temple in Jind. But left her in temple itself, and went to join duty in Leh just after the marriage. Later, the issues between them were settled by way of the compromise in question. Based on that, the two filed a joint petition for dissolution of marriage by mutual consent under Section 13(B)(i) of Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, and also the instant petition for quashing of FIR.

3. As the parties entered into a compromise to resolve their disputes which led to registration of the criminal case, they were directed to appear before the Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court for getting their statements recorded in that regard, vide order dated 29.03.2022. Pursuant thereto, a report dated 13.05.2022 has been received from Additional District & Sessions Judge, Jind, at Flag 'A', stating that the compromise arrived at between the parties is without any pressure, coercion or undue influence. There is no criminal case pending against the petitioner, nor has he been declared proclaimed person(s).

4. Learned State counsel and learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent No.2-complainant admit the factum of compromise, and submit that they have no objection to quashing of the FIR on that basis.

5. It has been held by the Supreme Court of India in cases *Gian Singh v. State of Punjab and another*, 2012(10) SCC 303 and *State of Madhya Pradesh v. Laxmi Narayan and others*, (2019) 5 SCC 688, that criminal cases having overwhelmingly civil character, particularly those arising out of commercial transactions or matrimonial relationships or family disputes, should be quashed when the parties have resolved their disputes among themselves in a *bona fide* manner by entering into a compromise.

6. Further, reference can also be made to Full Bench judgment of this Court in *Kulwinder Singh and others v. State of Punjab and another*, 2007(3) R.C.R.(Criminal) 1052, holding that on the parties settling their

disputes by way of a compromise, the High Court in exercise of power under Section 482 Cr.P.C. can allow the compounding of non-compoundable offences also, and quash the criminal proceedings to prevent abuse of the process of law or otherwise to secure the ends of justice. The power is not confined to matrimonial disputes alone.

7. A perusal of the allegations in the FIR as well as the aforesaid report establishes that the present case, arising out of matrimonial relationship, falls in the category of cases that can be quashed by the High Court in exercise of its inherent jurisdiction under Section 482 Cr.P.C., as per law laid down in the aforementioned judgments. The petitioner has no criminal antecedents. The offences alleged cannot be termed as crime against the society; nor do they show mental depravity of the petitioner. Since disputes between the parties have been amicably resolved by way of the compromise, continuation of criminal proceedings will be an exercise in futility, as chances of ultimate conviction are not there, and it will hamper their peaceful coexistence even after resolution of disputes.

8. Consequently, this petition is allowed. FIR No.08 dated 14.01.2018, registered under Sections 34, 376 (2)(n), 420, 498-A, 506 of IPC, at Police Station Women Cell, District Jind (Annexure P-1) and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom are hereby quashed *qua* the petitioners.

**(Tribhuvan Dahiya)**  
**Judge**

**23.03.2023**

Payal

Whether Speaking/ Reasoned:  
Whether Reportable:

Yes/ No  
Yes/ No