



CRM-M-33667-2024

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

262

CRM-M-33667-2024

Date of decision: August 21, 2024

SUNEEL KUMAR

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present:- Mr. Samir Rathaur, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Vikas Bhardwaj, AAG, Haryana.



CRM-M-33667-2024

*Learned counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, contends that the petitioner and respondent No.2 were having consensual relationship and due to some misunderstanding, FIR (supra) was registered against the petitioner. Now respondent No.2 has effected a compromise with the petitioner and both of them have settled their dispute amicably. 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 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 for 21.08.2024.

At this stage, on asking of the Court, Ms. Geeta Sharma, DAG, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1-State and Mr. A.K. Ranolia, Advocate accepts notice for respondent No.2 and files his Vakalatnama, which is taken on record. Copy of the paper book be supplied to them during the course of day.

Service is complete.



CRM-M-33667-2024

regarding the genuineness of compromise and also to intimate whether any PO proceedings are pending against any of the party on or before the date fixed.

A copy of the order be sent to learned trial Court/Illaq 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 (CrI.) 1052**, this petition is allowed and FIR No.146 dated 27.10.2023 under Sections 328, 376(2)(n), 506 of IPC, registered at Women Police Station Faridabad, District Faridabad (Annexure P-1) along with all subsequent proceedings arising of the same are quashed, qua the