



235 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-34728-2024 (O&M)
Date of decision: 23.08.2024

JAGDISH KUMAR @ RAVI

...PETITIONER

V/S

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Amit Malik, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Vikas Bhardwaj, AAG Haryana.

Mr. Manjeet Singh, Advocate
for respondent No. 2.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR J. (ORAL)

1. Instant petition has been filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. seeking quashing of the FIR No. 201 dated 05.10.2021, registered under Sections 323, 406, 498-A, 34, 354, 376, 506, 511 of the Indian Penal Code (Sections 34, 354, 376, 511 of IPC deleted later on) at Women Police Station Panipat, District Panipat and all subsequent proceedings arising out of the same, on the basis of compromise dated 16.04.2024 (Annexure P-2).

2. The following order was passed on 22.07.2024:

“Instant petition has been filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. seeking quashing of the FIR No. 201 dated 05.10.2021, registered under Sections 323, 406, 498-A, 34, 354, 376, 506, 511 of the Indian Penal Code (Sections 34, 354, 376, 511 of IPC deleted later on) at Women Police Station Panipat, District Panipat and all subsequent proceedings arising out of the same, on the basis of compromise dated 16.04.2024 (Annexure P-2).

*Learned counsel for the petitioner relies upon a judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Kapil Gupta Vs. State of N.C.T. of Delhi and another, 2022 (4) RCR (Crl.) 497**, to contend that FIR under Section 376 of IPC can be quashed on the basis of compromise. Learned counsel has further relied upon a judgment of*



2

*this Court in **Karan Sharma Vs. State of Haryana and another, 2021(1) Law Herald 149** and contends that once the parties have compromised the matter and decided to live in peace, no useful purpose will be served in allowing the criminal proceedings to continue.*

Notice of motion.

Mr. Ranvir Singh Arya, Addl. AG Haryana, who is present in the Court, accepts notice on behalf of respondent No. 1-State and Mr. Manjeet Singh, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of respondent No. 2 and filed power of attorney. Same is taken on record. Learned counsel for respondent No. 2 admits the factum of compromise.

Service is complete.

In the meantime, Parties are directed to appear before the learned trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate within a period of two weeks or any other date convenient to the trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate to get their statements recorded regarding the compromise and after recording their statements, learned trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate is directed to send report regarding the genuineness of the compromise and also to intimate whether any PO proceedings are pending against any of the party on or before the date fixed i.e. 23.08.2024.

A copy of this order be sent to learned trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate through fax for compliance.”

3. In compliance of the aforesaid order, a report has been received from the concerned jurisdictional Court that the compromise between the parties is genuine and arrived at without any pressure or coercion from anyone.

4. 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. 201 dated 05.10.2021, registered

under Sections 323, 406, 498-A, 34, 354, 376, 506, 511 of the Indian Penal Code (Sections 34, 354, 376, 511 of IPC deleted later on) at Women Police Station Panipat, District Panipat and all subsequent proceedings arising out of the same are quashed, qua the petitioner.

August 23, 2024
Ajay Goswami

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

(i)	Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
(ii)	Whether reportable	Yes/No