

267

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

CRM-M-23344 of 2016

Date of decision: August 30, 2016

Sarabjit Kaur and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Sushil Saini, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Ms. Rimplejeet Kaur, AAG Punjab.

Ms. Meghna Singla, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

A.B. CHAUDHARI, J (Oral)

Heard learned counsel for the rival parties.

In FIR No.81 dated 02.04.2015, under Sections 307, 365, 458, 427, 336, 342 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short ('IPC')) and Sections 25, 54, 59 of Arms Act, 1959 (for short 'Act'), registered at Police Station Jandiala Guru, District Amritsar Rural, the investigation was made and as stated by the learned State counsel, cancellation report was proposed and filed, but since the offence was under Section 307 IPC, the same was not accepted.

Learned counsel for the petitioners states that there is a compromise effected between the petitioners and respondent No.2-complainant.

Ms. Meghna Singla, Advocate appears for respondent

No.2-complainant. She makes a statement that now there is a compromise arrived at between the parties.

In the light of the above facts, I think compounding/compromise should be allowed.

In that view of the matter, FIR No.81 dated 02.04.2015, under Sections 307, 365, 458, 427, 336, 342 IPC and Sections 25, 54, 59 of the Act, registered at Police Station Jandiala Guru, District Amritsar Rural along with other consequential proceedings, stands quashed qua petitioners, in terms of compromise.

Petition stands disposed of, accordingly.

(A.B. CHAUDHARI)
JUDGE

August 30, 2016

mahavir

Whether speaking/ reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No