



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-36667-2024
Date of decision: 03.03.2025

TARUN MALIK ...PETITIONERS

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS ...RESPONDENTS

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present: - Mr. Yashveer Kharab, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Surender Singh, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Vishal Yadav, Advocate for
for respondents No.2 and 3.

SANJIV BERRY, J. (ORAL)

Reply dated 27.11.2024 in the form of an affidavit of Deputy Superintendent of Police, CAW, Panipat, has been filed. The same is taken on record. Copy thereof has been supplied to learned counsel for the petitioner.

2. By way of present petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023, petitioner seeks quashing of FIR (Annexure P-1) and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise/affidavit dated 20.07.2024 (Annexure P-2 and Annexure P-3) executed between the parties. Details of the FIR are as follows:

FIR No.	Dated	Sections	Police Station
349	13.09.2022	323, 354, 34, 452, 506 and 509 of IPC (Section 323, 354, 34 and 452 of IPC were deleted later on).	Sector 13-17 Panipat, District Panipat.



CRM-M-36667-2024

2

3. With the intervention of respectables and elderly people of the society, the parties have arrived at a settlement vide compromise/affidavit 20.07.2024 (Annexure P-2 and Annexure P-3), which is duly signed by them. The matter was referred to the Court below for recording of statements of the parties and to report with respect to genuineness of the compromise arrived at between the parties. Learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Panipat, vide report dated 10.09.2024 has apprised this Court that the compromise arrived at between the parties is genuine and without any pressure.

4. Learned counsel for respondents No.2 and 3 does not oppose the compromise having been effected between the parties.

5. In view of the report of the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Panipat, and in view of the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **“Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab and another”, 2012(4) RCR (Criminal) 543** and **“Narinder Singh and Others Vs. State of Punjab and Another”, (2014) 6 SCC 466**, this Court is of the opinion that no useful purpose can be served by keeping the criminal proceedings pending, since the respondents have themselves compromised the dispute with the petitioner/accused person.

6. In the circumstances, the present petition is allowed. FIR No. 349 dated 13.09.2022 under Sections 323, 354, 34, 452, 506 and 509 of IPC (Section 323, 354, 34 and 452 of IPC were deleted later on), registered at Police Station Sector 13-17 Panipat, District Panipat, and all



CRM-M-36667-2024

3

consequential proceedings arising therefrom, are hereby quashed on the basis of compromise qua the present petitioner.

03.03.2025

kanika

**(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE**

- | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|--------|
| i) | Whether speaking/reasoned? | Yes/No |
| ii) | Whether reportable? | Yes/No |