

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

243

CRM-M-31785-2021

Date of decision: 24.04.2023

Jarnail Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

.....Respondents

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

Present : Mr. Tarun Dhingra, Advocate  
for the petitioners.

Mr. Rahul Mohan, DAG, Haryana  
for respondent No.1-State.

Ms. Graciya Jain, Advocate for  
Ms. Monika Jangra, Advocate  
for respondent No.2.

\*\*\*\*

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

1. The instant petition is for quashing of FIR No.433 dated 19.08.2020 under Sections 307, 328 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 registered at Police Station Thanesar Sadar, District Kurukshetra and the consequential proceedings arising out of the same, on the basis of compromise (Annexure P-2) arrived at, between the parties.

2. The FIR in question came to be registered on account of a matrimonial discord between the petitioner and his wife i.e. the complainant/respondent No.2 wherein the latter alleged that the petitioner had attempted to poison her. Subsequent to the registration of the FIR in question, the parties ironed out their differences with the intervention of their family vide compromise (Annexure P-2).

3. Learned counsel for the parties submit that the parties after amicably resolving all their disputes and differences, are now happily

living together along with their children.

4. Vide order dated 18.11.2022 of this Court, the parties were directed to appear before the learned Trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate on 02.12.2022 to get their statements recorded regarding the compromise arrived at, between them.

5. Report has since been received from learned District and Sessions Judge, Kurukshetra, in pursuance of the directions 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-petitioner is quashed.

6. The Trial Court has annexed copies of the statements of the parties alongwith its report.

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

8. In view of the report of the learned District and Sessions Judge, Kurukshetra 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 Vs. 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.

9. Needless to say the parties shall remain bound by the terms of compromise and their statements recorded before the Court below.

24.04.2023

Vinay

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)  
JUDGE

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