

286

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

**CRM-M-10840 of 2015**

**Date of decision: August 01, 2016**

Mandeep Singh @ Mani

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondents

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

**Present:** Mr. D.S. Sandhu, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Ms. Rajni Gupta, Addl. AG Punjab.

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

\*\*\*\*

**A.B. CHAUDHARI, J (Oral)**

Heard learned counsel for the rival parties.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has invited my attention to compromise (Annexure P-3) arrived at between the parties. I have also seen the report from the Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Kapurthala who submits in its report that the statements of the parties have been recorded and the compromise appears to be genuine and without any pressure or influence.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was declared proclaimed offender but he had gone for employment in Saudi Arabia.

Be that as it may, in view of the compromise that has been arrived at between the parties which has been found to be without any pressure or influence, I am inclined to quash the FIR in question. FIR

No.116 dated 24.09.2009, registered under Sections 323, 380, 427, 149 of Indian Penal Code, 1860, at Police Station Sadar Kapurthala, District Kapurthala along with all consequential proceedings, stands quashed in terms of compromise.

Petition stands disposed of, accordingly.

**(A.B. CHAUDHARI)**  
**JUDGE**

**August 01, 2016**  
mahavir