

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

TAPINDER SINGH MANN  
20/07/2016 10:30

Cr. Misc. M 22878 of 2016  
Date of decision: 12.7.2016

Inderjit Singh @ Inder and ors

Petitioner

vs.

State of Punjab

Respondent

Present: Mr. Vivek Goel, Advocate.  
Mr., Nitin Rampal, Advocate

**M.M.S.BEDI,J.**

The petitioners had allegedly assaulted and threatened complainant- respondent No.2 , resulting in the registration of FIR.

Through the instant petition, quashing of FIR has been prayed for on the basis of compromise. It appears that the investigation is at initial stage. It is also not apparent from the petition whether the petitioners have protected their liberty by availing the remedy u/s 438 Cr.P.C. However, respondent No.2 has put in appearance through counsel, admitting that the matter has been compromised.

Notice of motion. On asking of the court, Ms. HK Athwal, DAG, Punjab has accepted notice. Copy given.

The petition is disposed of with a direction that in case complainant- respondent No.2 or any other person conversant with the facts of the case, approaches the investigating officer voluntarily and gives a statement/ supplementary statement, the said statement will not be ignored in view of the statutory provision of Section 163(2) Cr.P.C. by the investigating agency. In case during the course of investigation the investigating officer arrives at a conclusion that the circumstances warrant presentation of cancellation report, it will be open to the investigating officer to take appropriate steps to present the cancellation report before the court of competent jurisdiction, which could be accepted in case no protest is raised by the complainant or by any other veffected person.

Disposed of with the above observations. It will be appreciated in case the entire process is competed within a period of six months.

July 12 ,2016  
TSM

( M.M.S.BEDI )  
JUDGE