

281 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-52370-2023 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 18.12.2023

MOHIT @ MONTI AND OTHERS

...Petitioners

V/S

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Prashant Singh Chauhan, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Vikas Bhardwaj, AAG Haryana.

Mr. Himanshu Munjal, 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. 0064 dated 08.12.2022, registered under Sections 419, 420 and 120-B of Indian Penal Code at Police Station Cyber Crime District Chandigarh and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom in view of the compromise dated 26.12.2022 (Annexure P-2), wrongly mentioned as 29.12.2022.

2. The FIR has been registered on the statement of complainant-Tripti Devi-respondent No. 2 on the allegations that the complainant was searching for work from home and made a call on the whatsapp number 90411-9238 and one person namely Sandeep Kumar told the complainant for doing data entry work and asked to send Rs. 568/- as Registration Fees through QR code, which the complainant paid. Then again amounts of Rs. 1,40,404/- and Rs. 36,869/- were demanded through email ID

allindiajob3@yahoo.com, dineshbabudata0205@gmail.com and the

aforesaid amounts were also paid by the complainant, but when the complainant asked about releasing her salary, no response was received from the said whatsapp number or e-mail IDs. 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 has been received from Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Chandigarh 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 along with learned counsel for respondent No. 2 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 between the parties 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. 0064 dated 08.12.2022, registered under Sections 419, 420 and 120-B of Indian Penal Code at Police Station Cyber Crime District Chandigarh and all subsequent proceedings arising out of the same are quashed qua the petitioners only.

18.12.2023
Ajay Goswami

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

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