

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

287

**CRM-M No. 21728 of 2022
Date of Decision : 13.3.2023**

Hitesh Aggarwal and another

..... Petitioners

versus

State of Haryana and another

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present: Mr. Alok Mittal, Advocate, for the petitioners
Mr. Surender Singh, AAG, Haryana
Ms. Shaveta Sanghi, Advocate and
Mr. Aditya Sanghi, Advocate, for respondent no.2/complainant

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA J. (ORAL):

The instant petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. seeking quashing of FIR No.105 dated 29.7.2018 under Sections 323, 34, 354-A, 406, 498-A and 506 IPC registered at Women Police Station, Narnaul (Annexure P-1), and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, in view of the compromise/decreed of divorce by mutual consent, passed by the Family Court, Narnaul, on 4.3.2022.

2. 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 19.5.2022. Pursuant thereto, a report dated 26.9.2022 has been received from Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Narnaul, 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 petitioners, nor have they been declared proclaimed person(s).

3.

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.

4. 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. On similar lines is another judgment of the Supreme Court in *Shiji v. Radhika*, 2012 (1) SCC (Criminal) 101, wherein criminal proceedings for offences under Sections 354 and 394 IPC were quashed since the parties had entered into a compromise and there were no chances of conviction.

5. 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.

6. A perusal of the allegations in the FIR as well as the aforesaid report establishes that the present case, arising out of the 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 petitioners have no criminal antecedents. The offences alleged are not heinous in nature and cannot be termed as crime against the society; nor do they show mental depravity of the petitioners. 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.

7. Consequently, this petition is allowed. FIR No.105 dated 29.7.2018 under Sections 323, 34, 354-A, 406, 498-A and 506 IPC registered at Women Police Station, Narnaul (Annexure P-1), and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, are hereby quashed *qua* the petitioners.

8. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stands disposed of accordingly.

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE

13.3.2023

Ashwani

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