

267 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-30478-2023 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 12.12.2023

DHRUV

...Petitioner

V/S

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Shusham Kashyap, Advocate
for Mr. Sandeep Singal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Vikas Bhardwaj, AAG Haryana.

Mr. Vishva Nath Sharma, Advocate for respondent No. 2.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR J. (Oral)

1. This petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure seeking quashing of FIR No. 109 dated 14.05.2022, registered under Sections 406, 420 and 506 of Indian Penal Code at Police Station Farakpur, District Yamuna Nagar and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, in view of the compromise dated 09.06.2023 (Annexure P-2).

2. The FIR has been registered on the statement of complainant-Vishal Verma-respondent No. 2 on the allegations that the petitioner allured the complainant by taking Rs. 2,40,164/- and Rs. 1,95,520/- with the promise of providing permanent residence to son of the complainant in Canada, but later on he refused to fulfill his promise and threatened the complainant of giving beatings with the bouncers, in case he again inquires about providing permanent residence to his son. Now with the intervention of respectable persons, the matter has been amicably compromised between

the parties and they have resolved their disputes and differences.

3. Keeping in view the fact that the parties have entered into a compromise, they were directed to appear before the trial court/Illaq Magistrate for getting their statements recorded in support of the compromise. In pursuance of the direction, a report dated 24.11.2023 has been received from Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Jagadhri stating that the compromise arrived at between the parties is without any pressure or coercion from any one and the same is genuine one.

4. Learned Assistant Advocate General, Haryana on instructions from the Investigating Officer and learned counsel for respondent No. 2/complainant admitted the factum of compromise and submit that in case the parties have indeed settled their dispute, the State would have no objection to the quashing of the FIR, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record with their able assistance.

6. The parties have arrived at a compromise and settled their dispute. A compromise not only brings peace and harmony between the parties to a dispute, but also restores tranquility in the society. After considering the nature of offences allegedly committed and the fact that both the parties have amicably settled their dispute, continuance of criminal prosecution would be an exercise in futility, as the chances of ultimate conviction are bleak. A two Judge Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Shakunta Sawhney (Mrs) Vs. Kaushalya (Mrs.) and others (1980) 1 SCC 63***, speaking through Justice V.R. Krishna Iyer, has held as under:-

“4.The finest hour of justice arrives propitiously when

parties, despite falling apart, bury the hatchet and weave a sense of fellowship or reunion.....”

7. Consequently, keeping in view the fact that the dispute has been amicably settled and in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Narinder Singh and others vs. State of Punjab and another, (2014) 6 SCC 466 and Ramgopal and another Vs. State of Madhya Pradesh 2021 SCC OnLine SC 834** and Full Bench of this Court in **Kulwinder Singh Vs. State of Punjab 2007 (3) RCR (CrI.) 1052**, this petition is allowed and FIR No. 109 dated 14.05.2022, registered under Sections 406, 420 and 506 of Indian Penal Code at Police Station Farakpur, District Yamuna Nagar and all subsequent proceedings arising out of the same are quashed qua the petitioner only.

12.12.2023
Ajay Goswami

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

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