



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

**CRM-M-17037-2025
Date of decision: 28.04.2025**

Sandeep and others

....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Vikas Kumar Dhariwal, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Vikas Bhardwaj, AAG, Haryana.

None for respondent No.2.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR J. (Oral)

1. This petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.PC seeking quashing of FIR No.606 dated 28.12.2020 registered under Sections 323/34/379/452/506 IPC at Police Station Sonipat Sadar, District Sonipat, and all other subsequent proceedings arising therefrom in view of the compromise dated 17.03.2025.

2. The following order was passed on 27.03.2025:-

“This petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. seeking quashing of FIR No.0606 dated 28.12.2020 under Sections 323/34/379/452/506 of IPC registered at Police Station Sonipat Sadar, District Sonipat (Annexure P-1) along with all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise deed dated 17.03.2025 (Annexure P-2).

Notice of motion for 28.04.2025.

At this stage, on the asking of the Court, Ms. Geeta Sharma, DAG, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of respondent



No.1-State and Mr. Paras Malik (respondent No.2 in person) accepts notice and admits to the factum of compromise. Copy of the paper book be supplied to them during the course of day.

Service is complete.

In the meanwhile, the parties are directed to appear before the learned trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate within two weeks from today or any other date convenient to the trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate, to get their statements recorded regarding compromise and after recording their statements, learned trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate is directed to send report 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/Illaqa Magistrate through fax for compliance.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that although injured Kamlesh has not been impleaded as a party, however, at the time of recording of statements of the parties in terms of compromise, said Kamlesh has appeared before the trial Court and her statement was recorded separately wherein she submitted that the compromise arrived by her is genuine, voluntarily and without any undue influence and out of her own free will.

4. In compliance of the aforesaid order, a report dated 22.04.2025 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.

5. 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* 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 (Crl.) 1052*, this petition is allowed and FIR No.606 dated 28.12.2020 registered under Sections 323/34/379/452/506 IPC at Police Station Sonipat Sadar, District Sonipat and all other subsequent proceedings arising out of the same are quashed, qua the petitioners.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

28.04.2025

sonia

Whether speaking/reasoned:
Whether reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No