

**240 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-55445-2023 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 15.12.2023

VIKRAM KAPOOR AND ANOTHER

...Petitioners

V/S

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Ankur Pandey, Advocate for
Mr. Manuj Nagrath, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Madhur Sharma, AAG Punjab.

Mr. Deepanshu Sharma, Advocate for
Mr. Sourav Kumar Ghai, Advocate
for respondents No. 2 to 4.

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. 18 dated 02.10.2023, registered under Section 447, 420, 511 and 120-B of Indian Penal Code at Police Station NRI, Ludhiana and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom in view of the compromise dated 23.10.2023 (Annexure P-2).

2. The FIR has been registered on the statement of complainant-Sunita Verma-respondent No. 4 on the allegations the complainant is having a plot in Kulliyewal, Hadbast No. 178, near Bhamian Road, Ludhiana and the said plot was purchased around 17 years ago. The complainant is residing in USA and came to know from her relative that some unknown person is trying to encroach upon the above mentioned plot. 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, Ludhiana 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 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 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 (CrI.) 1052**, this petition is allowed and FIR No. 18 dated 02.10.2023, registered under Section 447, 420, 511 and 120-B of Indian Penal Code at Police Station NRI, Ludhiana and all subsequent proceedings arising out of the same are quashed qua the petitioners only.

15.12.2023
Ajay Goswami

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

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