

JASKARAN SINGH

...Petitioner

V/S

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

...Respondent

CORAM: HON’BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present:     Mr. Shvetanshu Goel, Advocate  
                  for the petitioner.

                  Mr. Vikas Bhardwaj, AAG Haryana.

                  Mr. Rakesh Dhiman, Advocate  
                  for respondent No. 2.

\*\*\*\*\*

**HARPREET SINGH BRAR J. (ORAL)**

1.            Present petition has been filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. seeking quashing of the FIR No. 229/2017 dated 04.06.2017 registered under Sections 279/337/338 of Indian Penal Code (Annexure P-6) at Police Station Bilaspur, District Gurugram.
2.            Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that during the pendency of present petition, this Court had referred the matter to Medication and Conciliation Centreu of this Court and relegated the parties to appear before it. Both the parties have amicably settled their dispute and as per the terms and conditions of the settlement drawn by the Mediator, both the parties have acted upon the same and petitioner has paid a sum of Rs. 5,50,000/- to the complainant-respondent No. 2 and Civil Revision No. 5566-2018 titled as **Jaskaran Singh Vs. Mithlesh Kumar Ojha and Others**, which was listed before this Court today itself, has been withdrawn.
3.            In view of the report of the Mediator and further in view of the compromise and the ratio of law laid down by the Hon’ble Supreme Court in

Narinder Singh and others vs. State of Punjab and another, (2014) 6 SCC 466, Ramgopal and another Vs. State of Madhya Pradesh 2021 SCC OnLine SC 834 and Shakuntala Sawhney (Mrs) Vs. Kaushalya (Mrs.) and others (1980) 1 SCC 63 and Full Bench of this Court in Kulwinder Singh Vs. State of Punjab 2007 (3) RCR (Crl.) 1052, this petition is allowed and FIR No. 229/2017 dated 04.06.2017 registered under Sections 279/337/338 of Indian Penal Code (Annexure P-6) at Police Station Bilaspur, District Gurugram and all subsequent proceedings arising out of the same are quashed, qua the petitioners.

4. However, the respondent No. 2 would be at liberty to pursue his claim before Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, concerned, irrespective of the fact that the compromise has taken place between the parties.

5. Pending CRM(s), if any, are also disposed of accordingly.

15.03.2024  
Ajay Goswami

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)  
JUDGE

|                           |        |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| Whether reportable        | Yes/No |