



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

268

CRM-M-12715-2024 (O&M)
Date of decision: 25.11.2024

NAVEEN HUSSAIN

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE HARPREET KAUR JEEWAN

Present : Mr. Sushil Kumar Verma, Advocate and
Mr. Rajat Verma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Deepak Kumar Grewal, DAG, Haryana.

Ms. Neha Bindal, Advocate for
Mr. S.S. Gill, Advocate
for the respondent No.2.

HARPREET KAUR JEEWAN, J.

[1] The present petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of FIR No.16 dated 18.02.2020, under Sections 120-B, 354, 384, 388, 389, 499 and 500 IPC and Section 67 of the Information Technology (Amendment) Act, 2008 registered at Women Police Station Sirsa, District Sirsa (Annexure P-1), on the basis of compromise deed dated 05.03.2024 (Annexure P-5) executed between the parties.

[2] Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the FIR was registered at the instance of respondent No.2 on account of a misunderstanding



CRM-M-12715-2024 (O&M) - 2-

between parties. He also submits that there are three accused named in the FIR namely Chhuttan Kha, Sabir Ali and Naveen Hussain (the present petitioner). However, the petition for quashing of the said FIR filed on behalf of the two accused namely Chhuttan Kha and Sabir Ali has already been allowed by this Court vide order dated 05.11.2024 passed in CRM-M-47617-2023. He further contends that the matter has been settled between the parties and compromise deed dated 05.03.2024 (Annexure P-5) has been executed between them, as such, respondent No.2 does not want to take any action in the FIR.

[3] Learned counsel for respondent No.2 confirms about the factum of compromise between the parties.

[4] On 14.03.2024, the parties were directed to appear before the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate for recording of their statements regarding the compromise.

[5] As per the report dated 18.04.2024 received from Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Sirsa forwarded through the office of District and Sessions Judge, Sirsa, compromise effected between the parties is genuine, voluntary and without any coercion or undue influence. The petitioner has not been declared as 'proclaimed offender'.

[6] Learned State counsel has not raised any objection regarding the acceptance of the present petition.

[7] Keeping in view the fact that the compromise between the parties is genuine and voluntarily made and in view of the ratio of the decision of Hon'ble Apex Court in **Gian Singh Versus State of Punjab (SC) 2012 (4) RCR (Criminal) 543** and the decision of Hon'ble the Full Bench of this Court in **Kulwinder Singh and others vs. State of Punjab and others 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052**, the



ends of justice would meet if the FIR and consequential proceedings are quashed by accepting the compromise between the parties.

[8] Consequently, this petition is allowed and FIR No.16 dated 18.02.2020, under Sections 120-B, 354, 384, 388, 389, 499 and 500 IPC and Section 67 of the Information Technology (Amendment) Act, 2008 registered at Women Police Station Sirsa, District Sirsa (Annexure P-1) and all the subsequent proceedings emanating therefrom are ordered to be quashed, qua the petitioner.

[9] However, the respondent No.2 and the State shall be at liberty to seek cancellation of this order, in case the final terms and conditions of compromise (Annexure P-5) are violated.

[10] Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(HARPREET KAUR JEEWAN)
JUDGE

25.11.2024
P.Bhatt

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