

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.8975 of 2024
Date of decision: 20th April, 2024

Udaibir Singh & others

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana & another

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Jagdeep S. Rana, Advocate for the petitioners.
Mr. Rajesh Gaur, Addl. Advocate General, Haryana
for the respondent/State.
Mr. Nikhil K. Vashisht, Advocate along with
Respondent No.2.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing FIR No.58 dated 26.06.2014 registered under Sections 406, 498-A, 354-A, 323, 506 and 34 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Mansa Devi, Panchkula along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 20.21.2023 (Annexure P-5) affected between the parties in the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court.

2. Vide order dated 28.02.2024 of this Court, the parties were directed to appear before the learned trial Court/Illaq Magistrate to get their statements recorded regarding the compromise arrived at, between them.

3. Report has since been received from learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Panchkula, in pursuance of the direction of this Court, wherein, the factum of the compromise arrived at between the parties stands verified and confirmed. As per the report, compromise has indeed been affected between the parties and the same is without any pressure or coercion and out of their free will and the complainant has also made statement to the effect that he would have no objection if the FIR qua the accused-petitioners is quashed.

4. The trial Court has annexed the statements of the parties in original, along with its report.

5. Learned State counsel too submits that there are no other accused other than the petitioners and respondent No.2 is the only aggrieved person in the FIR in question.

6. Complainant/respondent No.2, who is present in person along with her counsel, has received an amount of ₹20.00 lacs by way of demand draft in the Court today; a copy of the demand draft has been placed on record. The complainant does not dispute the factum of the compromise arrived at between the parties. She also does not oppose the prayer made for quashing of the FIR in question. She has no objection if the amount of ₹10.00 lacs which was ordered to be deposited before the trial Court vide order (Annexure P-6) dated 07.03.2019, is released to the accused Anita Singh.

7. In view of the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, the report of the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate,

Panchkula and the principles laid down by the Apex Court in ‘**Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab and others**’ (2012) 10 SCC 303, and also by the Full Bench of this Court in ‘**Kulwinder Singh and others v. State of Punjab and another**’ 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052, the instant petition is allowed. The aforesaid FIR and all consequential proceedings arising out of it qua the petitioners, are quashed.

8. Needless to say, the parties shall remain bound by the terms of compromise and their statements recorded before the Court below.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

April 20, 2024
rps

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