

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

255

CRM-M-57925-2023

Date of Decision: December 20, 2023

Sanjeev Sehgal and others

.....Petitioner(s)

Vs.

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Amrit Singh Kang, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Madhur Sharma, AAG, Punjab

Mr. Amandeep Singh Sidhu, 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.19 Dated 12.05.2021 registered under Sections 406 IPC at Police Station NRI District Police Commissionerate Ludhiana, on the basis of compromise dated 12.10.2023 (Annexure P-2).

2. The FIR has been registered on the statement of complainant-Vikram Sharma-respondent No.2 on the ground that the accused-petitioners, who are his wife and in-laws family have duped him on the pretext of sending him abroad for higher studies and later on started threatening for dire consequences. 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 issued by this Court vide order dated 17.11.2023, a report dated 28.11.2023 has been received from Judicial Magistrate First 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 State counsel on instructions from the Investigating Officer and learned counsel for the complainant-respondent No.2 admit 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. In a decision, based on compromise, none of the parties is a loser. Rather, 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 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.19 Dated 12.05.2021 registered under Sections 406 IPC at Police Station NRI District Police Commissionerate Ludhiana (Annexure P-1) and all subsequent proceedings arising out of the same are quashed qua the petitioners only.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

December 20, 2023
sonia arora

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