



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

275

CRM-M-4076-2024 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 18.12.2024

SAGAR AND ORS.

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present : Ms. Usha Rani, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Ramender Singh Chauhan, AAG Haryana.

Ms. Sonia Arora, Advocate for respondent No.2.

SANJIV BERRY, J. (ORAL)

1. At the outset, it has been pointed out by learned counsel for the petitioners that while filing the petition, inadvertently, in the memo of parties, State of Punjab has been impleaded as respondent No.1 instead of State of Haryana. She submits that the same is typographical error and prays for impleading State of Haryana in place of State of Punjab.
2. In view of the above, prayer is allowed. State of Haryana is ordered to be impleaded as respondent No.1 in place of State of Punjab.
3. Registry is directed to carry out necessary amendments.
4. By way of present petition filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, petitioners seek quashing of FIR (Annexure P-1) and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise/settlement dated 08.01.2024 (Annexure P-2) executed between the parties. Details of the FIR are as follows:



FIR No.	Dated	Sections	Police Station
70	23.03.2023	148, 149, 323, 342, 427 and 506 IPC; (325 IPC added later on)	Ismailabad, District Kurukshetra

5. With the intervention of respectables and elderly people of the society, the parties have arrived at a settlement vide compromise deed dated 08.01.2024 (Annexure P-2), which is duly signed by them. The matter was referred to the Court below for recording of statements of the parties and to report with respect to genuineness of the compromise arrived at between the parties. The learned JMIC/Principal Magistrate, JJB, Kurukshetra vide report dated 07.03.2024 and learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, Pehowa vide report dated 16.04.2024 have apprised this Court that the compromise arrived at between the parties is genuine and without any pressure. The petitioners have also deposited the cost of Rs.25,000/- in compliance to the order dated 25.01.2024.

6. Respondent No.2 is represented by his counsel and does not oppose the compromise.

7. In view of the aforesaid reports of the learned JMIC/Principal Magistrate, JJB, Kurukshetra and learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, Pehowa dated 07.03.2024 and 16.04.2024 respectively and in view of the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in “Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab and another”, 2012(4) RCR (Criminal) 543 and “Narinder Singh and Others Vs. State of Punjab and Another”, (2014) 6 SCC 466, this Court is of the opinion that no useful purpose can be served by keeping the criminal



proceedings pending, since the complainant has himself compromised the dispute with the petitioners/accused persons.

8. In the circumstances, the present petition is allowed. FIR No.70 dated 23.03.2023 under Sections 148, 149, 323, 342, 427 and 506 IPC; (325 IPC added later on) registered at Police Station Ismailabad, District Kurukshetra (Annexure P-1) and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, are hereby quashed on the basis of compromise qua the present petitioners.

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

18.12.2024

S.Sharma(syr)

i)	Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
ii)	Whether reportable?	Yes/No