

284 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
 CHANDIGARH
 CRM-M-48864-2023 (O&M)
 Date of Decision: 14.12.2023

SUNIL KUMAR

...Petitioners

V/S

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Amit Shokeen, Advocate for
 Mr. Ashwani Bhardwaj, Advocate
 for the petitioner.

Mr. Vikas Bhardwaj, AAG Haryana.

Mr. Ajay Wadhwa, 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. 138 dated 24.05.2017, registered under Sections 498-A, 406 and 323 of the Indian Penal Code at Police Station Women, Gurugram District Gurugram and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom in view of the compromise dated 11.05.2023 (Annexure P-2).

2. The FIR has been registered on the statement of complainant-respondent No. 2 on the allegations that both the petitioner and respondent No. 2 got married to each other on 12.11.2016. But since the beginning of the marriage, both the petitioner and respondent No. 2 has matrimonial disputes and differences and both have been living separately for each other since 12.03.2017. 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 06.11.2023 has been received from Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Gurugram 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 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.

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

7. 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.....”

8. Consequently, keeping in view the fact that the dispute has been amicably settled between the remaining petitioners and respondent No. 2/complainant 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 (Crl.) 1052**, this petition is allowed and FIR No. 138 dated 24.05.2017, registered under Sections 498-A, 406 and 323 of the Indian Penal Code at Police Station Women, Gurugram District Gurugram and all subsequent proceedings arising out of the same are quashed qua the petitioner only.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

14.12.2023
Ajay Goswami

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