

275

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-57481-2023

Date of Decision:- 06.02.2024

Kartik and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr.Inderpreet Singh Kooner, Advocate
for the petitioners.
Mr.Abhinash Jain, DAG, Haryana.
Ms.Shruti Sharma, Advocate for respondent No.2.

Kuldeep Tiwari, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition filed under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C., proffers the hereinafter extracted relief, as craved by the petitioners, inasmuch as, quashing of the FIR No.398, dated 22.09.2022, under Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959, and , under Sections 34, 379-B and 506 of the IPC, 1860, registered at Police Station I.M.T. Rohtak, District Rohtak (Annexure P-1), along with all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of a compromise dated 03.11.2023 (Annexure P-2), as entered into *inter se* the petitioner and the complainant/respondent No.2.

2. Upon an affirmative response from the learned counsel for the respondent **No.2** *qua* the compromise (Annexure P-2), **this Court had**, through an order drawn on 15.11.2023, upon the instant petition, directed the parties to appear before the learned trial Court/Illaq Magistrate concerned, for getting their respective statements recorded *qua* authenticity of the compromise (Annexure P-2). Moreover, the learned trial Court/Illaq Magistrate concerned was also directed to send a report in the above regard.

3. Consequent to the making of the directions (supra), the parties appeared before the 21.11.2023 and got their respective statements recorded, thereby authenticating the compromise (Annexure P-2). Accordingly, in compliance of the directions (supra) of this Court, Reports bearing No.914 dated 24.11.2023, and No.1 dated 06.01.2024 have been received from the Principal Magistrate, Juvenile Justice Board, Rohtak, and Additional District and Sessions Judge, Rohtak, respectively wherein, a satisfaction has been recorded *qua* the compromise (supra) being drawn in a genuine and voluntary manner, without any coercion or undue influence.

4. I have heard counsel for the parties and gone through the case file.

5. A Co-ordinate Bench of this Court, in **CRM-M-25669-2020 (O&M)**, titled **“Abhishek Singh & others V/s State of Punjab & others”**, **Pronounced on: 07.04.2022**, while granting a similar relief, as craved in the instant petition, has observed as under:-

“9. The following aspects would be relevant to conclude this petition:-

a) The accused and the private respondents have amicably settled the matter between them in terms of the compromise deed and the statements recorded before the concerned Court;

b) A perusal of the documents reveal that the settlement has not been secured through coercion, threats, social boycotts, bribes, or other dubious means;

c) The victim has willingly consented to the nullification of criminal proceedings;

d) There is no objection from the private respondents in case present FIR and consequent proceedings are quashed;

e) In the given facts, the occurrence does not affect public peace or tranquillity, moral turpitude or harm the social and moral fabric of the society or involve matters concerning public policy;

f) The rejection of compromise may also lead to ill will. The pendency of trial affects career and happiness;
g) There is nothing on the record to prima facie consider the accused as an unscrupulous, incorrigible, or professional offender;
h) The purpose of criminal jurisprudence is reformatory in nature and to work to bring peace to family, community, and society;
i) The exercise of the inherent power for quashing the conviction, sentence and all previous proceedings is justified to secure the ends of justice.”

6. In the light of the hereinabove recorded aspects and considering the fact that the offences, for which the petitioner/accused **has/have** been charged, are not grave in nature, as also in view of the law laid down in ***Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab and another, 2012 (4) RCR (Criminal) 543*** and ***Kulwinder Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab 2007(3) RCR (Criminal) 1052***, the present petition for quashing the FIR (supra) is hereby allowed.

7. Resultantly, FIR No.398, dated 22.09.2022, under Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959, and , under Sections 34, 379-B and 506 of the IPC, 1860, registered at Police Station I.M.T. Rohtak, District Rohtak (Annexure P-1), along with all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of a compromise dated 03.11.2023 (Annexure P-2), as entered into *inter se* the petitioners and the respondent No.2/complainant, are **quashed** subject to the payment of costs of Rs.5,000/- by each of the petitioners, to be forthwith deposited with the District Legal Services Authority concerned.

06.02.2024
sd

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

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