

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

**CRM-M No.34279 of 2022
Date of Decision: 23.08.2023**

Manav Monga

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and Ors.

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA

Present:- Mr. D.S.Sandhu, Advocate, appearing for
Mr. O.P. Kamboj, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gurlal Singh Dhillon, AAG, Punjab,
for respondents No.1 to 3.

Mr. Manu Loona, Advocate,
for respondent No.4.

* * * *

MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA, J.(ORAL)

By way of the instant petition, the petitioner has prayed for the quashing of the FIR bearing No.71 dated 24.03.2022 registered at Police Station Civil Lines Bathinda, District Bathinda, under Sections 354-D, 447, 506, 509 IPC and Section 67(A) of the Information Technology Act, 2000 as well as all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, while averring that the parties have arrived at a compromise qua their dispute, culminating in the registration of the said FIR.

2. Bereft of unnecessary details, the allegations, as levelled by respondent No.2 in the subject FIR, are that the petitioner had prepared the video-clip while she was bathing and changing the clothes and he uploaded

the obscene and nude photographs as the Status on his mobile phone and threatened to kill her and her parents and her father-in law also tried to outrage her modesty.

3. Vide the order dated 27.01.2023 as passed by the Co-ordinate Bench, the parties had been directed to appear before the concerned Illaqa Magistrate on 02.02.2023 for recording their statements in respect of the afore-referred compromise and in compliance of this order, learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Bathinda, recorded their (parties') statements and has submitted his report (as already available on the file), while mentioning therein that from the statements of the parties, the compromise affected between them appeared to be genuine and it was not the result of any fraud or misrepresentation and had been affected by the parties out of their free will and that except the petitioner, no other person had been nominated as the accused in the subject FIR and as per the statement of the Investigating Officer, Inspector Yadwinder Singh, there is only one complainant, i.e respondent No.4 in the present case. The copies of the statements of the complainant, the petitioner and the said Investigating Officer, have been annexed with the above-said report.

4. I have heard learned counsel appearing for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel and learned counsel for respondent No.4 in the instant petition and have also perused the file thoroughly.

5. The afore-mentioned compromise has been affected to put the dispute between the parties at rest for all the times to come and it being so, there are bleak chances of the conviction of the petitioner and in these

circumstances, the continuation of the proceedings in the case arisen out of the subject FIR, would be an exercise in futility.

6. Keeping in view the above-discussed facts and circumstances and also the observations as made by Hon'ble the Supreme Court in **Gian Singh Versus State of Punjab and another (2012) 4 RCR (Criminal) 543,** the FIR bearing No.71 dated 24.03.2022 registered at Police Station Civil Lines Bathinda, District Bathinda, under Sections 354-D, 447, 506, 509 IPC and Section 67(A) of the Information Technology Act, 2000 as well as all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom (if any), are hereby quashed. The petition in hand stands allowed accordingly.

23rd August, 2023
seema

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned:</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Whether Reportable:</i>	<i>No</i>