

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-21610-2016

Date of decision: September 28, 2016.

Nisha @ Avinash Kumar and another

... **Petitioners**

v.

State of Punjab and another

... **Respondents**

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

Present: Shri Sukhdeep Singh Bhinder, Advocate for the petitioners.

Ms. Rimpaljeet Kaur, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

Shri Amandeep Singh Cheema, Advocate for respondent No.2.

A.B. Chaudhari, J. (Oral):

In FIR No.123 dated 7.6.2016, registered under Sections 384, 506, 511 IPC, Police Station Kotwali, Bathinda, the petitioners are being prosecuted for the said offences. Learned counsel for the complainant, Shri Amandeep Singh Cheema, Advocate, is present and makes a statement that the compromise has been arrived at and the complainant has received back his money.

The offence is indeed serious but then, the counsel for the complainant himself says that the parties have arrived at a compromise Annexure P-2 and does not want to proceed further against the petitioners. Even if this Court is not convinced that in such cases of extortion compounding should be allowed, the fact remains that in the ultimate trial, the complainant would turn hostile and would bring the entire proceedings

at a naught. In that view of the matter, compounding is allowed. The FIR in question is quashed, along with all consequential proceedings.

Disposed of.

September 28, 2016.
kadyan

[**A.B. Chaudhari**]
Judge

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No