## IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

<u>Sr. No. 249</u> <u>CRM-M-14562-2021</u>

<u>Date of decision : 14.10.2022</u>

Meena Sharma ..... Petitioner

**VERSUS** 

State of Haryana and another

..... Respondents

<u>CORAM</u>: <u>HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL</u>

<u>Present</u>: None for the petitioner.

Mr.Karan Sharma, DAG, Haryana.

None for respondent No.2.

\*\*\*\*\*

## DEEPAK SIBAL, J. (ORAL)

The present petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of FIR No.53 dated 12.02.2021 registered under Sections 67, 67-A of the Information Technology Act and Section 354-D, 506 and 34 IPC at Police Station, Chandimandir, Panchkula and all proceedings arising therefrom qua the petitioner on the basis a written compromise dated 20.03.2021 (Annexure P-2) entered into between the parties.

On 08.04.2021 this Court had directed the parties to appear before the Area Magistrate for recording of their respective statements with regard to the compromise, who in turn was directed to submit a report along with the recorded statements with regard to the authenticity of the compromise and that it has been arrived at without any kind of undue influence or pressure as also to verify whether there is any other person involved in the occurrence, who is not a party to the present petition and whose consent for the compromise would be required, if this Court comes to the conclusion that the FIR sought to be quashed can be so quashed.

<u>CRM-M-14562-2021</u> [2]

As directed, report dated 07.05.2021 from the Additional Chief

Judicial Magistrate, Panchkula has been received as per which the parties had

recorded their statements before the Trial Court in terms of the compromise

arrived at between them; the same is authentic and has been entered into by the

parties without any undue influence or pressure and that there is no other

person involved in the occurrence, who is not a party to the present petition and

whose consent for the compromise would be required, if this Court comes to the

conclusion that the FIR sought to be quashed can be so quashed.

Learned State counsel has no objection if the present petition is

allowed.

In view of the above, continuation of the proceedings in pursuance

of the afore-referred FIR in which offences are not heinous as also the matter

having been compromised, would be an abuse of the process of law and in

terms of the law laid down by the Supreme Court in Narinder Singh vs. State of

Punjab (2014) 6 SCC 466, this Court deems it just and proper to allow the

petition and resultantly quash FIR No.53 dated 12.02.2021 registered under

Sections 67, 67-A of the Information Technology Act and Section 354-D, 506

and 34 IPC at Police Station, Chandimandir, Panchkula and all proceedings

arising therefrom qua the petitioner.

14.10.2022

shamsher

[DEEPAK SIBAL]
JUDGE

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