



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

CRM-M No.21043 of 2024
Date of decision: 29th July, 2024

Pritam Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana & another

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Parveen Gaur, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Yuvraj Shandilya, Asst. Advocate General, Haryana
for the respondent/State.

Mr. Mukesh K. Sharma, Advocate for respondent No.2.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking quashing of FIR No.381 dated 11.11.2012 under Sections 406, 420, 467, 468, 471, 506 and 120-B of the IPC registered at Police Station Shahabad, District Kurukshetra along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom including judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 12.09.2017/14.09.2017 passed by JMIC, Shahabad on the basis of compromise dated 21.03.2024 (Annexure P-3).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the parties have arrived at an amicable settlement vide Annexure P-3, subsequent to the conviction of the petitioner. In support of his submissions, he has placed reliance upon judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Criminal Appeal No.1489 of 2012 titled as 'Ramgopal & another vs.***



State of Madhya Pradesh' decided on 29.09.2021 and another judgment of this Court in '*Sube Singh and another Vs. State of Haryana and another*' : 2013(4) RCR (Criminal) 102.

3. Learned counsel appearing for respondent No.2 does not dispute the submissions made by counsel opposite and the factum of compromise having been indeed arrived at between the parties.

4. Vide order dated 29.04.2024 of this Court, the parties were directed to appear before the learned Appellate Court to get their statements recorded regarding the compromise arrived at, between them.

5. Report has since been received from learned Additional Sessions Judge, Kurukshetra, in pursuance of the directions 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 effected between the parties and the same is without any pressure or coercion and out of their free will and the complainant has also made a statement to the effect that he would have no objection if the FIR *qua* the petitioner is quashed.

6. The learned Additional Sessions Judge, Kurukshetra has annexed a copy of the statements of the parties, alongwith his report.

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



8. In view of the report of the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Kurukshetra and the principles laid down by Hon'ble the Apex Court in *Criminal Appeal No.1489 of 2012 titled as 'Ramgopal & another vs. State of Madhya Pradesh'* decided on 29.09.2021 and this Court in *Sube Singh and another Vs. State of Haryana and another : 2013(4) RCR (Criminal) 102*, the instant petition is allowed. The aforesaid FIR and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom including judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 12.09.2017/14.09.2017 passed by learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Shahbad, are quashed.

9. 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

July 29, 2024
rps

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