

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

Date of Decision:20.2.2015

CRM-M-14935 of 2014

Bahinder Singh and others

---Petitioners

versus

State of Punjab and another

---Respondents

CRM-M-14334 of 2014

Narinder Singh and others

---Petitioners

versus

State of Punjab and others

---Respondents

Coram: Hon'ble Mrs. Justice Rekha Mittal

Present: Mr.S.K.Bawa, Advocate
for the petitioners(s)
Mr. Ankur Jain,AAG Punjab
for respondent No. 1
Mr. J.S.Dadwal, Advocate
for the private respondent(s)

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

REKHA MITTAL, J.

This order will dispose of CRM-M-14935 of 2014 and CRM -
M- 14334 of 2014 as these are cases of version and cross version.

The petitioners have prayed for quashing of FIR No. 56 dated
12.6.2013 for offence punishable under Sections 323, 324, 506, 148, 149 of

the Indian Penal Code (in short “IPC”) and cross version recorded vide DDR No. 20 (A) dated 17.6.2013 for offence under Sections 323, 324, 506, 148, 149 IPC registered at Police Station, Garhshankar, District Hoshiarpur on the basis of compromise (Annexure P-3).

The parties were directed to appear before the trial court/Illaqa Magistrate to get their statements recorded with regard to genuineness of compromise.

A report has been submitted by the Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Garhshankar wherein it has been reported that statements of the petitioners, complainants and injured have been recorded and statements made by the parties in the Court reveal that they have voluntarily entered into a compromise with an intention to live in peace and harmony.

Counsel for the petitioners state that both the cases are version and cross version pertaining to FIR No. 56 dated 12.6.2013 and the parties have decided to give a quietus to their dispute with an intent to maintain harmonious relationship between the parties who are residents of the same village.

Counsel for the complainants have conceded to the fact that the parties have settled their dispute way of compromise and complainants and injured have got no objection if the aforesaid FIR, cross version and proceedings emanating therefrom are ordered to be quashed.

Mr. Ankur Jain, AAG, Punjab has put in appearance on behalf of respondent No.1. He has not disputed correctness of assertions of the petitioners and complainants that the matter has been settled by way of compromise between the parties.

I have heard counsel for the parties and perused the case file.

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 v. State of Punjab and another, 2012(4) R.C.R. (Criminal) 543*.

In view of what has been discussed hereinabove, the petitions are allowed and FIR No. 56 dated 12.6.2013 for offence punishable under Sections 323, 324, 506, 148, 149 IPC, cross version recorded vide 324, 506, 148, 149 IPC registered at Police Station, Garhshankar, District Hoshiarpur and proceedings emanating therefrom are ordered to be quashed, qua the petitioners.

(REKHA MITTAL)
JUDGE

20.2.2015
PARAMJIT