

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

**CRM-M No.26004 of 2022 (O&M)**  
Date of decision: 28<sup>th</sup> July, 2023

Mukesh Kumar & another

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana & others

... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL**

Present: Mr. Kapish Singla, Advocate for  
Mr. Ashit Malik, Advocate for the petitioners.

Ms. Jasleen Chahal, Asst. Advocate General, Haryana  
for the respondent/State.

Mr. Gautam Kumar, Advocate for respondent No.2.

Mr. Ajey Bishnoi, Advocate for respondent No.3.

**MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)**

**CRM No.19441 of 2023**

The instant application has been filed for impleading the complainant Naveen Bansal as a respondent No.3 to the instant petition.

In view of the averments made in the application and in the interest of justice, the same is allowed and the complainant is allowed to be impleaded as respondent No.3 to this petition.

Amended memo of parties is taken on record.

**CRM-M No.26004 of 2022**

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 482

Cr.P.C. for quashing FIR No.001 dated 02.01.2020 (Annexure P-1)

under Sections 406, 420, 467, 468, 47,1 212, 201, 506, 34 IPC registered at Police Station City Sonapat, District Sonapat along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 25.05.2022 (Annexure P-3) effected between the parties.

2. Vide order dated 08.06.2022 of this Court, the parties were directed to appear before the learned trial Court/Illaq Magistrate on 21.06.2022 to get their statements recorded regarding the compromise arrived at, between them.

3. Report has since been received from learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Sonapat, in pursuance of 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 he would have no objection if the FIR qua the accused-petitioners is quashed.

4. The trial Court has annexed the statements of the parties in original, alongwith its report.

5. Learned State counsel too submits that there are no other accused other than the petitioners and respondents No.2 and 3 are the only aggrieved persons in the FIR in question.

6. In view of the report of the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Sonapat 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 **‘Kulwinder Singh and  
others v. State of Punjab and another’ 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal)  
1052,** the instant petition is allowed. The aforesaid FIR and all  
consequential proceedings arising out of it, are quashed.

7.           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**

**July 28, 2023**  
*rps*

|                           |        |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| Whether reportable        | Yes/No |