



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

257

CRM-M-4456-2024(O&M)
Date of Decision: 09.09.2024

SONU

....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present : Mr. Balkar Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Nidhi Garg, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Kewal Krishan, Advocate for
Mr. Deepak Mudgil, Advocate for respondent no.2.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of Code of Criminal Procedure for quashing of FIR No.452 dated 22.11.2023 under Sections 147, 149, 379, 427, 511 of IPC registered at Police Station Matlauda District Panipat, Haryana and all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise/affidavit (Annexure P-2).
2. This Court vide order dated 30.01.2024 had directed the parties to appear before the Illaqa/Duty Magistrate to get their statements recorded and the learned Magistrate was directed to send its report qua the genuineness of the compromise.
3. Pursuant to the aforesaid order, parties have appeared before the learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Panipat and got their statements recorded. On the basis of the statements so recorded, learned Magistrate has



submitted report dated 23.02.2024 to the effect that the compromise has been effected between the parties voluntarily and without any coercion or undue influence. It is further stated that in the FIR there were four accused namely Sonu, Shayma, Tida and Gaurav who were arrayed as accused in this case. However, through this petition only the present petitioner namely Sonu and the complainant have compromised the matter. Separate statement of present petitioner and complainant/respondent No.2 as well as the Investigating Officer had been recorded. It is further mentioned in the report that a compromise has been effected between the petitioner and complainant/respondent no.2 and the petitioner has not been declared proclaimed person in this case.

4. The factum of compromise having arrived at between the parties has not been disputed by learned State counsel as well as counsel for respondent No.2. Learned State counsel, however, has submitted that it is a case of partial compromise as the co-accused is not a party to the same and it might have repercussions upon the trial. In the opinion of this Court, since it has come on record that the compromise has been effected between the parties to maintain peace and harmony and as there are bleak chances of conviction of the petitioner, therefore, partial quashing or part quashing of the FIR qua the petitioner only, can be allowed. In this regard reliance can be placed upon the observations made by Delhi High Court in ***“Sunil Tomar Vs. State of NCT of Delhi”, 2022(2) CrI. CC 179*** and ***“Lovely Salhotra and another vs. State of NCT of Delhi”, (2018) 12 SCC 391*** as well as judgments passed by the co-ordinate Bench of this Court in ***“Parambir***



Singh Gill vs. Malkiat Kaur”, 2010 (1) RCR (Criminal) 256 and “Samay Singh vs. State of Haryana” 2023 NCPHHC 99612.

5 As per the discussion so made above, no useful purpose would be served to continue with the proceedings before the trial Court in the instant FIR.

6 Following the principles laid down by the Full Bench judgment of this Court in ***Kulwinder Singh and others Versus State of Punjab and another 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052*** and approved by the Hon’ble Supreme Court in ***Gian Singh Versus State of Punjab and others (2012) 10 SCC 303***, this petition is allowed and FIR No.452 dated 22.11.2023 under Sections 147, 149, 379, 427, 511 of IPC registered at Police Station Matlauda District Panipat, Haryana and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise/affidavit (Annexure P-2) are quashed qua the petitioner namely Sonu herein only.

09.09.2024

Deepak Patwal

**(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE**

1. Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
2. Whether reportable : Yes/No