

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

**(295)**  
**1. CRM-M-8925-2024**

**2024:PHHC: 045680**  
**Date of Decision: 03.04.2024**

Sonu @ Sonu Lohchab @ Sawan

--Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana & another

--Respondents

**2. CRM-M-45247-2023**

Dheeraj Midha

--Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana & another

--Respondents

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI.**

Present:- Mr. Sandeep Verma, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Yuvraj Shandilya, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. B.S. Saroha, Advocate for respondent no.2.

\*\*\*

**KULDEEP TIWARI.J (Oral)**

1. Both the petitions are interconnected, therefore, being amenable for common decision, same are taken up together.

2. The instant petitions, as cast under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C., proffer the hereinafter extracted relief, as craved by the petitioners, inasmuch as, quashing of the FIR No.667, dated 20.10.2016, under Sections 406, 420, 506 and 120-B of IPC, registered at P.S. Samalkha, District Panipat, and all consequent proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of a compromise dated 29.1.2024 (Annexure P-2), as entered into inter se the petitioner(s) and respondent No.2.

2. Upon an affirmative response from the learned counsel for respondent No.2 qua the compromise (Annexure P-2), this Court, through orders drawn on dated 26.02.2024 (in CRM-M-8925-2024) and 12.9.2023 (in CRM-M-45247-2023), upon the instant petitions, besides issuing notice,

directed the parties to appear before the learned trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate concerned, for getting their respective statements recorded qua authenticity of the compromise (Annexure P-2). Moreover, the learned trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate concerned was also directed to send a report in the above regard.

3. Consequent to the making of the directions (supra), the parties appeared before the learned SDJM, Samalkha, and got their respective statements recorded, thereby authenticating the compromise (Annexure P-2). Accordingly, in compliance of the directions (supra) of this Court, two reports bearing No.375, dated 2.4.2024 (in CRM-M-8925-2024) and bearing no.1044 dated 16.11.2023 (in CRM-M-45247-2023), have been received from the learned SDJM, Samalkha, wherein, a satisfaction has been recorded by the Magistrate concerned qua the compromise (supra), being drawn in a genuine and voluntary and without any pressure or coercion and out of free will of the parties.

4. I have heard counsel for the parties and gone through the case file.

5. A Co-ordinate Bench of this Court, in **CRM-M-25669-2020 (O&M), titled “Abhishek Singh & others V/s State of Punjab & others”**, Pronounced on 07.04.2022, while granting a similar relief, as craved in the instant petition, has observed as under:-

“9. The following aspects would be relevant to conclude this petition:-

a) The accused and the private respondents have amicably settled the matter between them in terms of the compromise deed and the statements recorded before the concerned Court;

b) A perusal of the documents reveal that the settlement has not

been secured through coercion, threats, social boycotts, bribes, or other dubious means;

c) The victim has willingly consented to the nullification of criminal proceedings;

d) There is no objection from the private respondents in case present FIR and consequent proceedings are quashed;

e) In the given facts, the occurrence does not affect public peace or tranquillity, moral turpitude or harm the social and moral fabric of the society or involve matters concerning public policy;

f) The rejection of compromise may also lead to ill will. The pendency of trial affects career and happiness;

g) There is nothing on the record to prima facie consider the accused as an unscrupulous, incorrigible, or professional offender;

h) The purpose of criminal jurisprudence is reformatory in nature and to work to bring peace to family, community, and society;

i) The exercise of the inherent power for quashing the conviction, sentence and all previous proceedings is justified to secure the ends of justice.”

6. In the light of the hereinabove recorded aspects and considering the fact that the offences, for which the petitioners/accused have been charged, are not of grave in nature, as also in view of the law laid down in **Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab and another, 2012 (4) RCR (Criminal) 543** and **Kulwinder Singh, others Vs. State of Punjab 2007(3) RCR (Criminal) 1052**, the present petition for quashing the FIR (supra) is hereby allowed.

7. Resultantly, FIR No.667, dated 20.10.2016, under Sections 406, 420, 506 and 120-B of IPC, registered at P.S. Samalkha, District Panipat, and all consequent proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of a compromise (Annexure P-2) is quashed, subject to the payment of costs of Rs.5,000/-, to be forthwith deposited with the District Legal Services Authority concerned, to be deposited by the petitioners.

03.04.2024  
lucky

(KULDEEP TIWARI)  
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No