(2014) 07 P&H CK 0222

High Court Of Punjab And Haryana At Chandigarh

Case No: CRM-M-32863-2013

Parvinder Singh Kahlon		APPELLANT
	Vs	
State of Punjab		RESPONDENT

Date of Decision: July 14, 2014

Acts Referred:

- Penal Code, 1860 (IPC) - Section 406, 498A

Hon'ble Judges: Rekha Mittal, J

Bench: Single Bench

Advocate: R.K. Arya, Advocate for the Appellant; Neeraj Sharma, AAG and S.S. Kainth, Advocate for the Respondent

Final Decision: Allowed

Judgement

Rekha Mittal, J.
The petitioners have prayed for quashing of FIR No. 221 dated 11.06.2008 under Sections 406, 498A of the Indian Penal Code (in short "IPC") registered at Police Station Taripuri, Patiala.

2. In the instant case, the FIR was registered on the statement of respondent No. 2-complainant Gurnam Singh Khangura. Now the matter has been amicably settled between the parties.

3. Gurvinder Singh, attorney of complainant Gurnam Singh Khangura is present in Court with his counsel. His statement was recorded in the Court. An extract from his statement is quoted thus:-

I am the attorney of Gurnam Singh Khangura, the complainant in the case. Gurnam Singh Khangura lodged FIR No. 221 dated 11.06.2008, registered at Police Station Tripri, District Patiala for offence punishable under Sections 406 and 498A of the Indian Penal Code in regard to matrimonial disharmony between his daughter Harvinder Kaur and her husband Jagbir Singh Kahlon (petitioner No. 3) and his

family members.

Dispute between the parties has been settled by way of compromise and I recorded my statement before the Court below in regard to compromise as an attorney of complainant-Gurnam Singh Khangura. Gurnam Singh Khangura and his daughter Harvinder Kaur, residing in California, U.S.A. have furnished their duly sworn affidavits in regard to the settlement of dispute and the same be taken on record. I have no objection, if the aforesaid FIR and proceedings emanating therefrom, are ordered to be quashed.

4. Affidavits of Gurnam Singh Khangura (complainant) and Harvinder Kaur (daughter of the complainant) filed in the Court are taken on record.

5. Counsel for the petitioners submits that as the parties have amicably settled their differences, no useful purpose would be served by continuation of the criminal proceedings.

6. Counsel for the State has not disputed correctness of the contention of the petitioners and respondent No. 2 that the parties have arrived at an amicable settlement.

7. I have heard counsel for the parties and perused the records.

8. There is nothing on record to doubt correctness of the compromise effected between the parties, whereby they have decided to settle their dispute with an intention to live in peace and harmony. The present case falls in the category of cases, which can be allowed to be settled by way of compromise, in view of the decision of Hon''ble the Supreme Court of India in Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab and Another,

9. In view of what has been discussed hereinabove, the petition is allowed and FIR No. 221 dated 11.06.2008 under Sections 406, 498A IPC registered at Police Station Taripuri, Patiala and proceedings emanating therefrom are ordered to be quashed, qua the petitioners.