

124

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

CRM-M-22887 of 2016

Date of decision: September 29, 2016

Simaranjit Singh and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Harit Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

A.B. CHAUDHARI, J (Oral)

Heard learned counsel for the rival parties.

In FIR No.97 dated 01.04.2016, under Sections 379-B, 34, 511 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short 'IPC'), registered at Police Station Civil Lines, District Amritsar, petitioners have been prosecuted. I have seen the FIR in question. Indeed the allegations are that the petitioners had tried to snatch away the car of the complainant and in fact, were forcing themselves to enter the Car. Now, there is a compromise (Annexure P-2) arrived at between the parties. I have seen the compromise.

Since the complainant-driver has decided to enter into the compromise, I think it will be of no use to continue the prosecution of the petitioners 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 as per compromise (Annexure P-2).

However, since the criminal law was set in motion, the petitioners must have to pay costs to the State of Punjab.

Hence, this petition is allowed. FIR No.97 dated 01.04.2016, under Sections 379-B, 34, 511 IPC, registered at Police Station Civil Lines, District Amritsar alongwith all consequential proceedings, is quashed by way of compounding/compromise, subject to the petitioners paying costs in the sum of ₹5,000/ each, i.e. ₹20,000/- total with the office of Commissioner of Police, Amritsar within 8 weeks from today, failing which this order shall stand recalled automatically without reference to the Court.

(A.B. CHAUDHARI)
JUDGE

September 29, 2016

mahavir

Whether speaking/ reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No