

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

CRM-M-24074-2016

Date of decision: July 21, 2016.

Pawan Kumar

... **Petitioner**

v.

State of Punjab and another

... **Respondents**

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

Present: Shri Vikasdeep Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Rajni Gupta, Additional Advocate General, Punjab.

Shri Gurpreet Singh, Advocate for respondent No.2.

1. *Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?*
2. *Whether 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. Counsel for the complainant is also present. He has made a categorical statement that the complainant has decided to compound/compromise in FIR No.87 dated 11.6.2016, registered under Sections 420, 408, 380 IPC at Police Station Sultanpur Lodhi, District Kapurthala. Learned Counsel for the petitioner states that the alleged amount of embezzlement is only Rs.8,000/-.

At any rate, since the parties have compromised and the compromise deed is filed on record as Annexure P-2, I think even if the trial is allowed to continue, success in the trial is not likely for the prosecution. In that view of the matter, the present petition is allowed and the FIR in question, along with all the consequential proceedings, is quashed.

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

July 21, 2016.
kadyan