

261-2 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-49090-2022  
Date of decision: 06.12.2023

STEPHEN MASIH

...PETITIONER

V/S

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Vipin Mahajan, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Madhur Sharma, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Vishal Munjal, Advocate  
for respondent Nos.2 and 3.

\*\*\*\*

HARPREET SINGH BRAR J. (ORAL)

This petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure seeking quashing of FIR No.80 dated 12.06.2019 registered under Sections 292-A, 294, 506, 509 and 201 of Indian Penal Code and Sections 67, 67-A of Information Technology Act, 2000 at Police Station City Gurdaspur, District Gurdaspur, Punjab and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom in view of the compromise deed dated 25.07.2022 (Annexure P-2).

2. The FIR registered on the statement of complainant-respondent No.2 that petitioner was engaged with respondent No.3. However, the matrimonial alliance could not proceed further and engagement was also broken. Thereafter, the marriage of respondent No.3 solemnized and the petitioner uploaded the photographs of respondent No.3 and also sent the same to her husband and written some inappropriate contents. 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 07.02.2023 has been received from Chief Judicial Magistrate, Gurdaspur 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, Punjab, on instructions from the Investigating Officer and learned counsel for respondent Nos. 2 and 3 admitted the factum of compromise and submitted 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. A perusal of the report sent by Chief Judicial Magistrate, Gurdaspur, indicates that respondent No.2, who is the complainant in the present FIR has made the statement in terms of the compromise effected between the parties.

8. 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 (Crl.) 1052*, this petition is allowed and FIR No.80 dated 12.06.2019 registered under Sections 292-A, 294, 506, 509 and 201 of Indian Penal Code and Sections 67, 67-A of Information Technology Act, 2000 at Police Station City Gurdaspur, District Gurdaspur, Punjab and all subsequent proceedings arising out of the same are quashed qua the petitioner only.

December 06, 2023  
manisha

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)  
JUDGE

- |      |                           |        |
|------|---------------------------|--------|
| (i)  | Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| (ii) | Whether reportable        | Yes/No |