
(2011) 11 P&H CK 0117

In the Punjab And Haryana At Chandigarh

Case No : Criminal Miscellaneous No. M-34259 of 2011 (O and M)

Virender Singh

APPELLANT

Vs

State of Haryana and others

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 16-11-2011

Acts Referred:

Criminal Procedure Code, 1973 (CrPC) — Section 482
Penal Code, 1860 (IPC) — Section 120B, 420, 467, 468, 471

Citation : (2011) 11 P&H CK 0117

Hon'ble Judges : Ajai Lamba, J

Bench : Single Bench

Final Decision : Allowed

Judgement

Ajai Lamba, J.—This petition filed u/s 482 Cr.P.C. prays for quashing FIR No.58 dated 10.5.2003 (Annexure P-1) under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC, registered with Police Station, Kharkhoda, District Sonipat, on the basis of compromise, factum of which is reflected in affidavit sworn by respondent No.2, Het Ram Sharma.

2. Notice of motion.

3. At this stage, Mr. Gautam Dutt, Advocate, has put in appearance on behalf of respondent No.2-complainant with the plea that complainant is present in Court and is feeling harassed in going to the Court time and again.

4. On the asking of the Court, Mr. Sukhvinder Singh Nara, Senior Deputy Advocate General, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1. Complete copy of the petition has been handed over to him.

5. Learned counsel for the parties pray for the matter to be taken up today itself, in view of peculiar facts and circumstances of the case.

6. Ordered accordingly.

7. Learned counsel for the petitioner has pointed out that in the impugned FIR,

petitioner and respondent Nos.3 and 4 are the accused. It was a transaction, essentially of civil nature, in relation to land in village Kharkhoda. Disputes have been settled by way of compromise. Respondent No.2-complainant has been duly compensated and his land has been returned back.

8. Respondent No.2-complainant, Het Ram, as identified by his counsel Mr. Gautam Dutt, Advocate, who is present in Court, endorses the factum of compromise and the fact that land on account of which FIR was lodged, has been returned back to him. Complainant states that disputes have been settled with the petitioner as also the other accused namely respondent Nos.3 and 4, and therefore, FIR be quashed as the parties want to live in peace and harmony without complexities of criminal case.

9. Learned counsel for the respondent-State contends that because the parties have entered into a compromise, the petition for quashing FIR is not opposed.

10. Since the disputes have been settled by way of compromise and the parties want to live in peace and harmony, no purpose in law would be served by continuance of proceedings.

11. In view of the above, the petition is allowed. FIR No.58 dated 10.5.2003 (Annexure P-1) under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B IPC, registered with Police Station, Kharkhoda, District Sonipat, is hereby quashed.