

CRM-M-62725-2023
Date of decision: 05.01.2024

Parveen Kumar and another ...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Lalit Kumar Narang, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Ms. Geeta Sharma, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Akshay Bansal, Advocate
for respondents No.2 & 3.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. This petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure seeking quashing of FIR No.0581 dated 19.12.2020 under Sections 323/506/34 of Indian Penal Code (Section 325 of IPC added later on) registered at Police Station Meham District Rohtak (Annexure P-1) and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom in view of the compromise dated 09.12.2023 (Annexure P-2).

2. The FIR has been registered on the statement of complainant on the allegations that the accused-petitioners hurled abuses and hit the complainant with spade. Now with the intervention of respectable persons, the matter has been amicably compromised between the parties and they have resolved their disputes and differences.

3. Keeping in view the fact that the parties have entered into a compromise, they were directed to appear before the trial Court/Illaq

Magistrate for getting their statements recorded in support of the compromise. In pursuance of the direction, a report has been received from the learned Additional Civil Judge (Sr. Divn.)-cum-Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Meham stating that the compromise arrived at between the parties is without any pressure or coercion from any one and the same is genuine one.

4. The learned State counsel, on instructions from the Investigating Officer and learned counsel for the complainant/respondents No.2 & 3 admit the factum of compromise and submit that in case the parties have indeed settled their dispute, the State would have no objection to the quashing of the FIR, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record with their able assistance.

6. In a decision, 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. A two Judge Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Shakunta Sawhney (Mrs) Vs. Kaushalya (Mrs.) and others (1980) 1 SCC 63***, speaking through Justice V.R. Krishna Iyer, has held as under:-

“4.The finest hour of justice arrives propitiously when parties, despite falling apart, bury the hatchet and weave a sense of fellowship or reunion.....”

7. Consequently, keeping in view the fact that the dispute has been amicably settled and in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme

Court in ‘*Narinder Singh and others vs. State of Punjab and another*’, (2014) 6 SCC 466 and ‘*Ramgopal and another Vs. State of Madhya Pradesh*’ 2021 SCC OnLine SC 834 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.0581 dated 19.12.2020 under Sections 323/506/34 of Indian Penal Code (Section 325 of IPC added later on) registered at Police Station Meham District Rohtak (Annexure P-1) and all subsequent proceedings arising out of the same are quashed *qua* petitioners.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

05.01.2024
Neha

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