

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

CRM No.M-11814 of 2016

Date of decision: December 21, 2016

Satnam Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.B. CHAUDHARI

Present: Mr. Sunny Singla, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Deepak Grewal, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Saurabh Bhardwaj, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

Mr. B.S.Dhillon, Advocate
for respondent No.3 and 4.

A.B. CHAUDHARI, J (Oral)

Heard, learned counsel for the petitioner.

In FIR No.39 dated 02.05.2015, under Sections 406, 420, 468, 471, 506 of Indian Penal Code (for short 'IPC') registered at Police Station Jhansa, District Kurukshetra, the petitioner has been prosecuted. I have seen the FIR inquestion. Indeed the allegations are that the petitioner has duped the complainant for an amount of Rs.7,00,000/- on the pretext to send her son to U.S.A.

Now, there is a compromise (Annexure P-2) arrived at between the parties. I have seen the compromise.

Since, complainant-Manjeet Kaur has decided to enter into the compromise, I think it will be of no use to continue the prosecution of the petitioner as the complainant would turn hostile in the Court and thus, the trial would be entire waste.

In that view of the matter, I am inclined to allow the compounding/compromise on the basis of compromise (Anneuxre P-2).

Hence, this petition is allowed and FIR No.39 dated 02.05.2015, under Sections 406, 420, 468, 471, 506 of Indian Penal Code (for short 'IPC') registered at Police Station Jhansa, District Kurukshetra along with all consequential proceedings, are quashed by way of compounding/compromise qua the petitioner only.

(A.B. CHAUDHARI)
JUDGE

December 21, 2016

rajesh.k.khurana

Whether speaking/ reasoned	:	Yes
Reportable	:	No