

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent No.2-complainant has not disputed the factum of compromise.

5. Learned State counsel submits that in case the parties have indeed settled their dispute, the State would have no objection to the quashing of the FIR.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record.

7. In a decision, based on compromise, none of the parties is a loser. Rather, a compromise not only brings peace and harmony between the parties to a dispute, but also restores tranquility in the society. After considering the nature of offences allegedly committed and the fact that both the parties have amicably settled their dispute, continuance of criminal prosecution would be an exercise in futility, as the chances of ultimate conviction are bleak.

8. Following the principles laid down by the Full Bench judgment of this Court in *Kulwinder Singh and others Versus State of Punjab and another 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052* and approved by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Gian Singh Versus State of Punjab and others (2012) 10 SCC 303*, this petition is allowed and FIR No.232 dated 17.06.2024, under Sections 323, 34, 452 and 506 IPC registered at Police Station Sector-5, Gurgaon, District Gurugram (Annexure P-1) and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom are quashed qua the petitioners on the basis of compromise dated 21.06.2024 (Annexure P-2).

04.11.2024
Parveen kumar

(GURBIR SINGH)
JUDGE

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