

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA,
AT CHANDIGARH

242

CRM-M-15520-2015 (O&M)
Date of Decision : 15.12.2015

Raj Kumar Sandal and ors.

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.. Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE NARESH KUMAR SANGHI

Present : Mr.Amit Verma, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr.K.S.Pannu, DAG, Punjab.

Mr.Rahul Sharma, Advocate
for respondent Nos.2 and 3.

Naresh Kumar Sanghi, J. (Oral)

Prayer in this petition filed under Section 482, Cr.P.C.
is for quashing of FIR No.20, dated 20.03.2015, for the offences
punishable under Sections 406 and 498-A, IPC registered at
Police Station Talwara/Mushera Fery, District Hoshiarpur and all
the consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of
affidavit of respondent No.2, Annexure P/2.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that due
to temperamental differences, petitioner No.1 and respondent
No.3 could not pull on well and as such impugned FIR was
lodged by respondent No.2 i.e. father of respondent No.3.

During the pendency of the impugned FIR, better
sense has prevailed and Raj Kumar Sandal, petitioner No.1 and
Kanchan Thakur, respondent No.3 have sorted out their dispute

and effected a compromise. In pursuance thereof, the husband and wife i.e. petitioner No.1 and respondent No.3 are residing together and cohabiting as husband and wife. He further submits that in view of the compromise so effected, the affidavit executed by respondent No.2, the impugned FIR and all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom, may be quashed.

Learned State counsel on instructions from ASI-Tarsem Singh of Police Station Talwara, District Hoshiarpur, has no objection if the impugned FIR and all the consequential proceedings arising therefore, are quashed on the basis of compromise.

Shri Rahul Sharma, Advocate representing respondent Nos.2 and 3 has also admitted that petitioner No.1 and respondent No.3 are residing together happily and cohabiting with each other. He further submits that the affidavit (Annexure P/2) has been executed by respondent No.2 i.e. father of respondent No.3. He further submits that he has instructions to state at bar that respondent Nos.2 and 3 have no objection if the impugned FIR and all the consequential proceedings are quashed on the basis of compromise so effected between the private parties.

After hearing learned counsel for the parties, this Court finds that with the intervention of the respectable and relatives of both the sides, petitioners have resolved their dispute with respondent Nos.2 and 3.

Learned counsel for the parties are *ad idem* that in view of the compromise effected between the private parties, they do not have any objection if the impugned FIR and all the consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, are quashed.

As a sequel to the above and taking into consideration the ratio of the judgment delivered by Hon'ble the Supreme Court in the matter of **B.S. Joshi and others v. State of Haryana and another, 2003 (2) R.C.R. (Criminal) 888**, the present petition is allowed. FIR No.20, dated 20.03.2015, for the offences punishable under Sections 406 and 498-A, IPC, registered at Police Station Talwara/Mushera Fery, District Hoshiarpur and all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom, are hereby quashed.

[Naresh Kumar Sanghi]
Judge

15.12.2015
sd