

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

.....

Criminal Misc. No.M-34847 of 2014

.....

Date of decision:2.2.2015

Sanjay Kumar alias Sanjay and others

.....Petitioners

v.

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondents

....

Present: Mr. Veneet Sharma, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Amarinder Singh Klar, Assistant Advocate General,
Punjab for the respondent-State.

Mr. Varinder Kumar Sandhir, Advocate for complainant-
respondent No.2.

.....

Inderjit Singh, J.

This petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. praying for quashing of FIR No.125 dated 30.5.2013 (Annexure-P.1) registered for the offences under Sections 417, 406, 498-A, 493 and 120-B IPC at Police Station Sultanwind, Amritsar City, District Amritsar and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom in view of the compromise dated 9.9.2014 (Annexure-P.2).

Notice of motion has been issued in this case.

Mr. A.S. Klar, learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab has put in appearance on behalf of the respondent-State and Mr. Varinder Kumar Sandhir, learned Advocate has appeared on behalf of complainant-respondent No.2.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned

Assistant Advocate General, Punjab appearing for the respondent-State and learned counsel for the complainant-respondent No.2 and have gone through the record.

The parties appeared through their counsel and they were directed to appear before the trial Court on 5.12.2014 or any other date convenient to the trial Court for getting their statements recorded with regard to compromise and the case was adjourned to 22.12.2014. As per the report received from the learned trial Court, the parties did not appear for getting recorded their statements regarding compromise. Again, the parties were directed to appear before the trial Court on 12.1.2015 and to get recorded their statements regarding the compromise and the date in this case was fixed for today before this Court. Today, again report has been received that the parties had not appeared before the trial Court.

As the parties are not appearing before the trial Court to give their statements regarding compromise in compliance with the orders passed by this Court, therefore, this petition is liable to be dismissed for non-compliance of the orders of this Court.

Therefore, this criminal miscellaneous petition is dismissed.

February 2, 2015.

(Inderjit Singh)
Judge

hsp